Exhibit 2

In Re:

RESIDENTIAL CAPITAL, LLC, et al. Case No. 12-12020-mg

February 11, 2015

eScribers, LLC (973) 406-2250 operations@escribers.net www.escribers.net

To purchase copies of this transcript, please contact us by phone



1 2 (CC: Doc# 7552, 7904) Adjourned Hearing RE: Motion for Omnibus Objection to Claim(s) / ResCap Borrower Claims Trusts Seventy-3 Fifth Omnibus Objection to Claims (No Liability Borrower 4 5 Claims). Hearing Going Forward solely as to Claim of Alan 6 Moss. 7 8 (CC: Doc# 7841) Adjourned Hearing RE: The ResCap Liquidating Trusts Seventy-Ninth Omnibus Claims Objection (Purported 9 10 Administrative Claims). Hearing Going Forward on this matter, 11 solely as it relates to the Claim Filed by Martha S. 12 Panaszewicz. 13 14 Doc# 7922 Hearing RE: ResCap Borrower Claims Trusts Eightieth 15 Omnibus Objection to Claims (No Liability Borrower Claims). 16 17 Adversary proceeding: 14-01965-mg ResCap Liquidating Trust v. 18 Hewlett-Packard Financial Services Company 19 Case Management Conference 20 21 22 23 24 25

eScribers, LLC (973) 406-2250 operations@escribers.net | www.escribers.net

```
1
 2
    APPEARANCES:
    MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
 3
          Attorneys for ResCap Borrower Claims Trust
 4
 5
          250 West 55th Street
 6
          New York, NY 10019
 7
 8
    BY: JORDAN A. WISHNEW, ESQ.
 9
          JESSICA J. ARETT, ESQ.
10
11
    PACHULSKI STANG ZIEHL & JONES LLP
12
13
          Attorneys for ResCap Liquidating Trust
          10100 Santa Monica Boulevard
14
15
          13th Floor
          Los Angeles, CA 90067
16
17
18
    BY: JEFFREY P. NOLAN, ESQ. (TELEPHONICALLY)
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

eScribers, LLC | (973) 406-2250 operations@escribers.net | www.escribers.net

```
1
 2
    KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP
 3
          Attorneys for Ally Financial, Inc. and Ally Bank
 4
          601 Lexington Avenue
 5
          New York, NY 10022
 6
 7
    BY: RAY C. SCHROCK, ESQ.
 8
 9
10
    KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP
11
          Attorneys for Ally Financial
          300 North LaSalle
12
13
          Chicago, IL 60654
14
15
    BY:
          JUSTIN R. BERNBROCK, ESQ.
16
17
18
    HUSCH BLACKWELL LLP
19
          Attorneys for Liebert defendants
20
          4801 Main Street
21
          Suite 1000
          Kansas City, MO 64112
22
23
24
    BY: BENJAMIN F. MANN, ESQ.
25
```

eScribers, LLC | (973) 406-2250 operations@escribers.net | www.escribers.net

```
1
 2
    NORTON & ASSOCIATES, LLC
 3
          Attorneys for Liebert defendants
          8 West 40th Street
 4
 5
          Floor 12
 6
          New York, NY 10018
 7
 8
    BY: MICHAEL EDWARD NORTON, ESQ.
 9
10
    ROSALES DEL ROSARIO, P.C.
11
12
          Attorneys for Martha S. Panaszewicz
13
          3901 Main Street, Suite 605
          Flushing, NY 11354
14
15
16
    BY: JOHN ROSARIO, ESQ.
17
18
    ALSO PRESENT TELEPHONICALLY:
19
20
          DEANNA HORST, Chief Claims Officer,
21
             ResCap Liquidating Trust
22
          JOSEPH MORROW, Kurtzman Carson Consultants
23
          ALAN I. MOSS, Pro Se
24
          KATHY PRIORE, ESQ., Associate counsel to
25
             ResCap Liquidating Trust
                     eScribers, LLC (973) 406-2250
```

operations@escribers.net | www.escribers.net

1	PROCEEDINGS
2	THE COURT: All right. Please be seated. We're here
3	in Residential Capital, number 12-12020.
4	Who's going to begin?
5	MS. ARETT: Your Honor, Jordan Wishnew just went to
6	knock on chambers' door so
7	THE COURT: I'm sorry. I didn't understand a word you
8	just said.
9	MS. ARETT: I said Jordan Wishnew just went to knock
10	on your door, so I'll go grab him.
11	THE COURT: Okay.
12	(Pause)
13	MR. WISHNEW: My apologies, Your Honor.
14	THE COURT: That's okay, Mr. Wishnew.
15	MR. WISHNEW: I had simply gone to chambers to suggest
16	to Deanna if you want to take the adversary proceeding before
17	the claims matter, I could be okay with that.
18	THE COURT: Sure, let's do that. Okay. So this is
19	the adversary proceeding I don't know what the case number
20	is. Hold on. It's 15-01025, Romina Drennan (ph.), et al. v.
21	Certain Underwriters at Lloyds of London, et al. Is that the
22	one we're going to take now? No?
23	Which one are we doing, Mr. Wishnew?
24	MR. BERNBROCK: Good morning, Your Honor. I believe

25 it's adversary proceeding 14-01969.

RESIDENTIAL CAPITAL, LLC, ET AL.
THE COURT: Mr. Wishnew, is it in my agenda or not?
MR. WISHNEW: It was not on the agenda we prepared.
This is a separate agenda.
THE COURT: Oh, yeah, it's in here. What's the case
name?
MR. BERNBROCK: Your Honor, it's the ResCap
Liquidating Trust v. Liebert Corporation.
THE COURT: Okay. It's adversary proceeding 14-01969.
MR. BERNBROCK: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: It's the motion for default judgment.
MR. BERNBROCK: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Let me have the other appearances.
MR. NORTON: Your Honor, I'm Michael Norton, Norton &
Associates, for the third party plaintiffs in the adversary
action of the moving party. And Mr. Mann, from Husch Blackwell
in Kansas City, is the lead counsel. He's been admitted pro
hac vice, and he'll argue the motion, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Thank you. Anybody else?
MR. SCHROCK: Good morning, Your Honor.
MR. NOLAN: Your Honor
MR. SCHROCK: Ray Schrock of Weil Gotshal on behalf of
AFI.
THE COURT: I'm not used to you making that

eScribers, LLC \mid (973) 406-2250 operations@escribers.net \mid www.escribers.net

MR. NOLAN: Good morning, Your Honor. Jeff Nolan,

appearance, Mr. Schrock.

1	appearing telephonically, on behalf of the plaintiff, ResCap
2	Liquidating Trust.
3	THE COURT: All right.
4	MR. BERNBROCK: And good morning, Your Honor. Justin
5	Bernbrock, of Kirkland & Ellis, on behalf of Ally Financial,
6	Inc.
7	THE COURT: Thank you.
8	MR. BERNBROCK: Thank you.
9	THE COURT: Come on up.
10	MR. ROSARIO: Hello?
11	THE COURT: Is there somebody else making an
12	appearance?
13	MR. ROSARIO: Yes, Your Honor, my name is John
14	Rosario. I'm appearing telephonically for Martha Panaszewicz,
15	one of the claimants.
16	THE COURT: This is not you're not appearing on the
17	adversary proceeding I'm dealing with, so you'll get your
18	chance.
19	MR. ROSARIO: Oh, I'm sorry, Your Honor.
20	THE COURT: That's okay.
21	MR. ROSARIO: I just got passed in. Sorry.
22	THE COURT: That's fine.
23	Go ahead.
24	MR. MANN: Good morning, Your Honor. My name is
25	Benjamin Mann. I'm with the Husch Blackwell firm in Kansas

eScribers, LLC \mid (973) 406-2250 operations@escribers.net \mid www.escribers.net

City, and I represent the defendants in this adversary action in the third-party claim of the Liebert defendants.

We're here today on Liebert's motion for default judgment on its third-party complaint against Ally, which was filed as part of our answer to the ResCap Trust preference complaint filed against Liebert.

Liebert and Ally, Your Honor, had entered into a master agreement, back in July of 2011, for Liebert to provide goods and services to Ally and its affiliates, pursuant to projects that were going to go on. Ally remained responsible, under that contract, for payment of the goods and services.

Liebert provided goods and services, throughout 2011 and into early 2012. When ResCap and GMAC filed their Chapter 11 here, in May 2012, there were no outstanding projects, and all of the work had been paid for under the master agreement. So Liebert was not a creditor; it did not file a proof of claim.

THE COURT: Just get to the default judgment; I don't want the background.

MR. MANN: Yes, sir, Your Honor. We filed our third-party complaint, in which we asserted that if the payments were avoided, then Ally would be liable, under the master agreement, for those claims that were then no longer paid.

We sent Ally, by first-class mail, a summons and a copy of the third-party complaint, as provided by Bankruptcy

RESIDENTIAL CAPITAL, LLC, ET AL.

Rule 7004, on June 30th, 2014. It was mailed to the address that Ally had stated in the master agreement for the place where legal notice should be sent. No response was received, and we filed our request for the clerk to enter default -- an entry of default, and that occurred in September of 2014.

Ally's counsel then contacted us and asked if we would withdraw that request, for the time being, and they would make efforts to see if they could get the matter resolved. We agreed to do that. We agreed, in fact, to a standstill, specifically until December 1 of 2014, to allow that to happen.

Ally advised us that they were not able to get the matter resolved. We went ahead and filed our request for entry, on December 10th, and we then filed our motion, on January 5 of this year, for default judgment.

Ally objected and filed their brief on February 4th, and we filed our response to that objection yesterday, on February 10th.

Your Honor, under the Second Circuit, and specifically the case we cite in our brief, the David v. Dabirs (ph.) case, a Second Circuit decision in 2013, the Court is to consider three factors in whether to grant a motion for default judgment: whether the failure to answer was willful or was otherwise for some good reason, negligent or something else; second, does the defendant have a meritorious defense to the third-party -- in this case, a third-party complaint; and

RESIDENTIAL CAPITAL, LLC, ET AL.

thirdly, will the parties seeking the default be prejudiced if the default is not granted?

Now, in Ally's objection, Your Honor, they raise basically three principal objections. They claim that the default is excusable because they were not properly served. And they claim to have two meritorious defenses, one based on the nondebtor release that was provided to Ally in the debtors' bankruptcy plan, and also a meritorious defense based on an arbitration clause in the master agreement.

Ally makes a couple other, Your Honor, what I would call ancillary arguments that we've addressed in our brief, and I'm not going to address any further here other than to just mention them, and I think that they clearly don't have any bearing on this motion. They claim that we did not comply with the Local Rule to ask for the clerk's entry of default. We did. We did exactly that. The affidavit that my local counsel, Mr. Norton, filed, shows that we precisely followed that procedure and obtained the entry of default properly.

Next, they claim that our third-party claim is not a proper third-party claim. It is a classic third-party claim. We are claiming that if we are in fact liable to plaintiff, then Ally is liable to us, simply by the fact that right now we've been paid under the contract. If the plaintiff was able to have those claims avoided as preferences, so they did not exist, then Ally is in breach under the contract and owes us

the money.

And finally, they say that the preference claim is based on invoices that were paid and that Ally has nothing to do with those invoices. Those invoices were issued pursuant to projects that were pursuant to the agreement, so Ally is reliable to us on the agreement.

Let me first address Ally's first argument, the default. They claim that they were not properly served because the summons and complaint was mailed to them at an address in Fort Washington, Pennsylvania, and that is neither the place of their registered agent nor their principal place of business, and therefore proper service was not under Rule 7004.

The case law is clear; we've cited it our brief, Your Honor, that parties can agree on how or where they are to be served with notice of lawsuit. We cite the Greystone (ph.) case out of the Seventh District of New York. And that says that "The parties' contractual language, not the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, governs what constitutes proper service in this case."

Mr. Norton filed his initial certificate of service showing that we served the complaint and summon -- excuse me -- third-party complaint and summons on Ally at the address stated in the master agreement, in Fort Washington, Pennsylvania. He's also supplied, in our brief yesterday, his supplemental affidavit showing that we never rec -- he never

```
received anything from the post office indicating that that
 1
    service -- that mailing was not accomplished.
 2
             It is universally accepted case law that a mailing of
 3
    legal notice is presumption of receipt, and that presumption
 4
    can be rebutted, but not simply by testimony that I didn't get
 5
 6
    it. Ally submits an affidavit. Mr. Bernbrock, here today,
 7
    submitted his affidavit. He does say Ally didn't receive it,
    but he doesn't say how he knows that, and he certainly doesn't
 8
    say how it is that they know they did not get it.
 9
10
             He says that Liebert served the summons at the Fort
    Washington, Pennsylvania address, but he says that's the wrong
11
12
    address. He offers hearsay evidence from Ally's chief counsel,
13
    who told him that Fort Washington was not Ally's principal
    place of business and was not the office of chief counsel.
14
15
    Mr. Bernbrock goes on to say that he does not believe Ally does
    business there. But he does not address --
16
17
             THE COURT: What's the prejudice you're going to
18
    suffer?
19
             MR. MANN: I'm sorry, Your Honor?
             THE COURT: What is the prejudice that you're going to
20
    suffer?
21
22
             MR. MANN: Your Honor, I don't believe there's
23
    prejudice here. I --
```

MR. MANN: I agree. And I think the Court can

THE COURT: I don't either.

24

1	consider all or some of the factors. In fact, as I will
2	indicate in a second
3	THE COURT: I've read your papers. Let me hear from
4	Ally's counsel.
5	MR. MANN: Yes, Your Honor.
6	MR. BERNBROCK: Good morning, Your Honor. Justin
7	Bernbrock of Kirkland & Ellis, on behalf of Ally Financial.
8	Your Honor, the point that I would like to first make
9	is that we simply did not Ally simply did not receive notice
10	of this lawsuit.
11	THE COURT: But it was served on an appropriate
12	address, wasn't it?
13	MR. BERNBROCK: It was served on the Fort Washington,
14	Pennsylvania address which is
15	THE COURT: That was contractually agreed as an
16	address for service, correct?
17	MR. BERNBROCK: Your Honor, on the master services
18	agreement, to which the agreement between Liebert and Ally
19	does list Fort Washington, Pennsylvania, as a "legal notice"
20	THE COURT: Okay.
21	MR. BERNBROCK: address.
22	THE COURT: So that was a proper address for them to
23	serve the summons and complaint, correct?
24	MR. BERNBROCK: No, Your Honor, I do not believe so
25	THE COURT: Why not?

1	MR. BERNBROCK: for two reasons. The first, Your
2	Honor, is that is not Ally's principal place of business, and
3	therefore, service
4	THE COURT: Yes, but you could contractually agree
5	that service could be someplace other than what would be
6	permissible under the rules, correct?
7	MR. BERNBROCK: Yes, Your Honor.
8	THE COURT: And doesn't the master service agreement,
9	in identifying that address as a proper address for service,
10	satisfy the requirement of an alternative address, and that's
11	where it was served, so on that prong, you're wrong.
12	MR. BERNBROCK: Your Honor, I'm not willing to concede
13	that point because
14	THE COURT: Well, give me a case that supports your
15	position that service on the address stated in the contract is
16	not valid service.
17	MR. BERNBROCK: Your Honor, I can't give you that.
18	THE COURT: Okay.
19	MR. BERNBROCK: But
20	THE COURT: All right. Go to your next point.
21	MR. BERNBROCK: Yes, Your Honor. With respect to
22	notice under the contract, Your Honor, it's important to
23	note point out, rather, that there's a very specific dispute
24	resolution process under that agreement.
25	THE COURT: All right. Have you moved to compel

```
arbitration?
 1
             MR. BERNBROCK: No, Your Honor.
 2
 3
             THE COURT: Are you going to?
 4
             MR. BERNBROCK: No, Your Honor.
 5
             THE COURT: So go on to your next argument.
             MR. BERNBROCK: Yes, Your Honor.
 6
 7
             THE COURT: An arbitration clause -- a contract can
    have an arbitration clause, but unless somebody seeks to
 8
    trigger it, as far as the Court's concerned, it doesn't exist.
 9
10
    If a party to a contract, that has an arbitration clause that
    winds up in a court in a dispute, timely makes a motion to
11
12
    compel arbitration, the Court will consider it. But you
13
    haven't done it and you just told me you're not going to do it.
14
    So move on to your next point.
15
             MR. BERNBROCK: Your Honor, if I may.
16
             THE COURT: Go ahead.
17
             MR. BERNBROCK: The point that I'm trying to make is
    that when Ally and Liebert entered into this agreement, they
18
19
    contemplated a specific dispute resolution process.
    process did not contemplate litigation in a court.
20
    Therefore --
21
22
```

THE COURT: It doesn't stop somebody from filing a summons and complaint. And if you think that the proper forum is arbitration, you can move to compel arbitration. You've not done that.

23

24

25

eScribers, LLC | (973) 406-2250 operations@escribers.net | www.escribers.net

1	MR. BERNBROCK: Sure, Your Honor. My
2	THE COURT: Go on to your next point, please.
3	MR. BERNBROCK: Yes, Your Honor. As we've been before
4	Your Honor on numerous occasions, and as Your Honor is well
5	aware, the plan confirmed in the ResCap bankruptcy cases
6	contains a third-party release and injunction that bars this
7	action.
8	THE COURT: Well, I'm not making a decision whether
9	this action is barred or is not barred. The only issue for me
10	today is whether a default judgment should be entered. The
11	clerk's certificate of default, having previously entered a
12	motion for entry of default coming before me; if the matter
13	continues on, you'll have your opportunity to assert that the
14	third-party nondebtor release applies. That's not relevant to
15	what I have to decide today.
16	MR. BERNBROCK: Yes, Your Honor. Pursuant to
17	Bankruptcy Rule 7041, which incorporates Federal Rule 41, an
18	action taken in contravention of a court order is void,
19	pursuant to that rule. And therefore, the filing of the
20	lawsuit against Ally, the entry of the clerk by the of the
21	default by the clerk, and the subsequent movement for
22	THE COURT: You can just ignore
23	MR. BERNBROCK: default judgment
24	THE COURT: You could just ignore a proper service of
25	a summons and complaint and after a default judgment was

1	entered you come in and argue then that, oh, it doesn't matter
2	because the complaint never should have been filed? Is that
3	what your position is?
4	MR. BERNBROCK: Your Honor, our position is that
5	THE COURT: Is that your position?
6	MR. BERNBROCK: No, Your Honor.
7	THE COURT: Okay.
8	MR. BERNBROCK: When we learned
9	THE COURT: So let's move on and address there may
10	or may not be an appropriate time to address the issue of
11	whether the third-party nondebtor release applies to the claim.
12	It isn't today. I don't want to hear any more argument about
13	the third-party nondebtor release.
14	What else do you have to say?
15	MR. BERNBROCK: Your Honor, I have no further
16	arguments.
17	THE COURT: Do you want to address the issue of
18	prejudice, or just stand on the moving party's concession that
19	there is no prejudice?
20	MR. BERNBROCK: We agree with the moving party
21	THE COURT: Okay.
22	MR. BERNBROCK: that there will be no prejudice.
23	THE COURT: All right. Anybody else want to be heard?
24	MR. NOLAN: Your Honor, Jeff Nolan, on behalf of the
25	ResCap Liquidating Trust.

THE COURT: Yes, go ahead. 1 2 MR. NOLAN: The Court hasn't raised any issue -- I 3 believe it was raised in one of the briefs and the response, 4 about staying the avoidance case. It does not sound like that's an issue the Court is --5 6 THE COURT: I'm not staying the avoi --7 MR. NOLAN: -- taking an --THE COURT: I'm not staying the avoidance case. 8 MR. NOLAN: All right. No further comments from the 9 10 Trust, Your Honor. 11 THE COURT: All right. Go ahead, Mr. Schrock. 12 MR. SCHROCK: Good morning, Your Honor. Ray Schrock for Weil Gotshal, on behalf of AFI. 13 14 Just two quick points. Your Honor, on the meritorious 15 defense, we do believe we have several the meritorious defenses that we've outlined in our papers. We'll stand on our papers 16 17 with regard to that. 18 With regard to prejudice, to make sure the record's clear, we think that there obviously would be substantial 19 prejudice to AFI if a default were entered. I take your point, 20 21 Your Honor, about service at ResCap's address. We didn't get 22 it. As soon as we found out about this, we did reach out to counsel. We've been trying to facilitate a resolution and 23 24 avoid what we thought was, frankly, needless litigation. There

hasn't been a settlement reached yet, but we'd like the

opportunity, with Your Honor's permission, to present our case and to deal with the issue, if we have to do so, in court.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Schrock.

MR. SCHROCK: Thank you.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: All right. The motion for entry of a default judgment is denied. This case is, as far as the Court is concerned, at a very early stage. The courts generally have a strong preference to decide matters on the merits. issues about service are -- let me put it this way -- somewhat cloudy. I'm not making a decision of whether service at the Pennsylvania address was or was not proper. Assuming it was proper, I nevertheless, conclude that this is a substantial matter; there are serious issues. While I'm not deciding whether there are meritorious defenses, having reviewed the papers, the Court believes that Ally has, in good faith, asserted what may well turn out to be meritorious defenses that ought to be decided on the merits, and that Ally would be substantially prejudiced if a default judgment is entered, and Liebert would not be prejudiced by the denial of the motion. The case is going to move forward. So the motion for entry of a default judgment is denied.

Ally's counsel should submit an order that simply says, for the reasons stated on the record, the motion for entry of a default judgment is denied.

MR. SCHROCK: Thank you.

```
THE COURT: All right. Counsel are excused on this
 1
 2
    matter, if they wish to be.
 3
             All right. Mr. Wishnew?
 4
             MR. WISHNEW: Okay.
 5
             MR. NOLAN: Your Honor, Jeff Nolan, on behalf of the
 6
    Liquidating Trust. Can I be heard one minute on a different
 7
    adversary that is on the Court's docket but I don't believe is
 8
    at issue?
             THE COURT: All right. Go ahead. Which one?
 9
                                                            This
10
    Hewlett Pack --
11
             MR. NOLAN: In the -- yes, Your Honor.
             THE COURT: All right. Let me --
12
13
             MR. NOLAN: 14-01965.
14
             THE COURT: Okay. ResCap Liquidating Trust v.
15
    Hewlett-Packard Financial Services Company. Yes, go ahead.
             MR. NOLAN: Your Honor, we had previously appeared
16
17
    before the Court and advised that we have a settlement. There
18
    is a settlement agreement. It has been executed by the
    Liquidating Trust. I have not received a signed paper
19
    back -- or signed papers back yet from the defendant. And it
20
21
    has a ten-day effectuation of terms. But I would anticipate
22
    that this would be removed from the Court's docket probably
23
    within the next fifteen days.
24
             THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Mr. Nolan.
25
             When that happens, because I don't necessarily see
```

everything	that happens	on the docket,	could you	send a letter
to post	it on ECF and	send a copy to	chambers	so that I know
what the st	atus is.			

MR. NOLAN: Yes, Your Honor. Thank you.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you very much.

Okay, Mr. Wishnew?

MR. WISHNEW: Thank you, Your Honor. Jordan Wishnew, Morrison & Foerster, for the ResCap Borrower Claims Trust.

Moving to the agenda docket at 8094, the first matter going forward this morning is, under Roman numeral III, on page 8, the ResCap Borrower Claims Trust's Seventy-fifth omnibus objection to claims. That was originally filed at docket 7552.

There's only one claim going forward this morning,

Your Honor. That's the claim of Mr. Alan Moss. This pertains
to a claim that was adjourned, by mutual agreement of the
parties, in part, so that the Borrower Trust had an opportunity
to ensure all of its arguments were before the Court at one
time, as opposed to taking a piecemeal approach to the
objection.

As a result, the Borrower Trust filed its reply and supplemental objection to address the issues not originally raised in the objection. The Borrower Trust coordinated a briefing schedule with Mr. Moss to allow Mr. Moss the opportunity to respond to the additional arguments made in the supplemental objection.

1	THE COURT: Let me is Mr. Moss appearing by
2	telephone? Mr. Moss? Is anybody appearing he's shown as
3	checked in.
4	Mr. Moss, are you on the phone?
5	MR. MOSS: Sorry. Your Honor?
6	THE COURT: Is that you, Mr. Moss?
7	THE OPERATOR: Mr. Moss' line is live, Your Honor.
8	THE COURT: Mr. Moss, are you on a cell phone?
9	MR. MOSS: Can you hear me?
10	THE COURT: I can hear you now. Are you on a cell
11	phone?
12	MR. MOSS: I am on a cell phone, yes.
13	THE COURT: Mr. Moss, you've been cutting in and out.
14	I can hear you now. We're going to move forward. I'll give
15	you a chance. I'm going to let Mr. Wishnew argue first, and
16	then I'll give you a chance to respond.
17	MR. MOSS: All right. Thank you.
18	THE COURT: Are you able to call in on a landline?
19	MR. MOSS: I am not, Your Honor. I don't have a
20	landline.
21	THE COURT: All right. Okay. Go ahead, Mr. Wishnew.
22	MR. WISHNEW: Thank you, Your Honor. On December
23	19th, the Borrower Trust filed the aforementioned reply and
24	supplemental objection in support of the objection. That was
25	docketed at 7904. The claimant filed his response on January

RESIDENTIAL CAPITAL, LLC, ET AL.

23rd, 2015, docketed at 8044. And the Borrower Trust filed its reply on February 5th, docketed at 8073.

Your Honor, through the seventy-fifth omnibus claims objection the Borrower Trust seeks to expunge those proofs of claim that do not represent valid pre-petition claims against the debtor, because they do not prove, by a preponderance of the evidence, any specific wrongdoing by the debtors.

The Borrower Trust thoroughly examined the debtors' books and records in an effort to validate the allegations made in Mr. Moss' response, and the claims at issue, and determined that the books and records do not show any liability due and owing to the claimant.

In support of the objection and the reply, the
Borrower Trust submitted a supplemental declaration by Ms.

Deanna Horst, chief claims officer to the ResCap Liquidating

Trust, as Exhibit 1 to the reply and supplemental objection and

Exhibit 1 to the reply. Ms. Horst is on the phone today and

available to answer any questions the Court might have.

For the reasons set forth in the objection and the reply, Mr. Moss has not demonstrated any liability of the debtors related to the actions of executive trustee services as substitute trustee.

I won't burden the Court reiterating every argument in our pleadings, but I'd like to briefly highlight the major points.

THE COURT: Let me -- I'd rather -- I have specific 1 2 questions I want to ask. 3 MR. WISHNEW: Okay. 4 THE COURT: All right? Under what circumstances may a borrower assert a claim against a trustee of a deed of trust, 5 6 in connection with filing of a notice of default, in sale of 7 the property under California law? MR. WISHNEW: To my knowledge, Your Honor, only if it 8 is made with actual malice. And that is not -- there's not any 9 10 evidence to that effect. 11 THE COURT: Well, this is not an evidentiary hearing, 12 Mr. Wishnew. MR. WISHNEW: Correct, Your Honor. 13 14 THE COURT: So let's -- so you say it has to be with actual malice. It appears to the Court that there are at least 15 two Civil Code -- California Civil Code Statutory sections that 16 17 have to be brought to bear: California Civil Code Section 2924, which provides, in part: "In performing acts required by 18 19 this article, the trustee shall incur no liability for any good-faith error resulting from reliance on information 20 21 provided in good faith by the beneficiary regarding the nature 22 and the amount of the default under the secured obligation,

So 2924 says no liability for any good-faith error.

MR. WISHNEW: Correct, Your Honor.

deed of trust, or mortgage." I'll stop the quote there.

23

24

1	THE COURT: So if it goes on, later in the section,
2	to say, "The mailing, publication, and delivery of notices" as
3	required herein, and the "performance of the procedures set
4	forth in this article shall constitute privileged
5	communications within Section 47." So that's Section 47 of
6	this California Civil Code.
7	MR. WISHNEW: Um-hum.
8	THE COURT: And when you say it has to be actual
9	malice, you're, I take it, referring to Section 47, how a claim
10	could be saved from the privilege. Your position is it has to
11	be with actual malice.
12	MR. WISHNEW: I would yes, Your Honor.
13	THE COURT: All right. So the two things it has to
14	be, one, an absence of good faith
15	MR. WISHNEW: Um-hum.
16	THE COURT: and actual malice?
17	MR. WISHNEW: Correct, Your Honor.
18	THE COURT: So tell me, what's the standard for actual
19	malice?
20	MR. WISHNEW: Actual malice, to the best of my
21	knowledge, Your Honor, is with malicious intent. And that
22	certainly was not evident here. ETS was taking its
23	instructions from the beneficiary, and publishing the notice it

was being asked to publish, as part of pursuing a foreclosure

on behalf of the beneficiary.

24

THE COURT: Let me ask you this, do you agree that the 1 2 substitution of trustee was not properly done, that the party that substituted ETS as trustee didn't have the authority to do 3 4 so at the time that the substitution was signed? 5 MR. WISHNEW: That is my understanding, Your Honor, 6 yes. 7 THE COURT: Okay. All right. So in the Kachlon v. 8 Markowitz --9 MR. WISHNEW: Yes, Your Honor. 10 THE COURT: -- case --11 MR. WISHNEW: Um-hum. 12 THE COURT: -- the court said this, "Mere negligence 13 in making a sufficient inquiry into the facts on which the 14 statement was based does not, of itself, relinquish the 15 privilege." It's referring to the Section 47 privilege. inadvertence or forgetfulness, or careless blundering, is no 16 17 evidence of malice. While the concept of negligence is 18 inherent in the issue of probable cause, the decisions long ago 19 recognized that to constitute malice the negligence must be such as 'evidenced a wanton and reckless disregard of the 20 21 consequences and of the rights and of the feelings of others'". 22 The Kachlon case is 168 Cal. App. 4th 316. I'm looking at pages 341 of 44, is what I'm looking at. 23 24 So do you agree that the quote from Kachlon I've read 25 is the correct standard for --

1	MR. WISHNEW: I do, Your Honor.
2	THE COURT: Okay.
3	MR. WISHNEW: I do.
4	THE COURT: In the next paragraph, that court went on
5	to say the servicer there was Best Alliance. "Best
6	Alliance's omissions were, at worst, negligent. No evidence
7	suggested that it acted with ill will or with reckless
8	disregard for the truth of the notice of default."
9	Do you agree that if a claim or a complaint properly
10	alleged reckless disregard for the truth, that that would state
11	a claim against the loan servicer, the substitute servicer?
12	MR. WISHNEW: Based on the phrasing of Kachlon v.
13	Markowitz, yes, I would agree with Your Honor's statement.
14	THE COURT: Right. So now take me through and I'm
15	going to have this question for Mr. Moss as well. The issue
16	for me is whether the proof of claim sufficiently alleges
17	reckless disregard for the truth, wanton or reckless disregard
18	of the consequences. So I'm tracking the two different
19	paragraphs in the Kachlon decision.
20	MR. WISHNEW: Um-hum.
21	THE COURT: And take me through why you believe the
22	proof of claim insufficiently alleges facts that would be
23	required to be alleged in order for a borrower to be able to
24	assert a claim against the trustee under the deed of trust.
25	MR. WISHNEW: Sure. So first, Your Honor, the proof

1	of claim itself is limited to the proof of claim form and a
2	notice of rescission of the trustee's deed upon sale. And I
3	think, with regards to what's attached to the proof of claim,
4	admittedly, there were, as Your Honor pointed out, questions
5	about the substitution of trustee. But there were
6	THE COURT: When you say "questions", you agreed
7	earlier that it appears that the party that executed the
8	substitution of trustee didn't have authority to do so
9	MR. WISHNEW: Yes.
10	THE COURT: at the time it was done, correct?
11	MR. WISHNEW: Yes, thank you.
12	THE COURT: Okay.
13	MR. WISHNEW: Your Honor
14	THE COURT: So start with that assumption.
15	MR. WISHNEW: put it much more eloquently than I
16	did.
17	THE COURT: Okay.
18	MR. WISHNEW: So starting with that premise, there
19	were remedial actions taken, after the fact, to correct what
20	was previously in error. There were rescissions filed.
21	Trustee's deeds upon sale were rescinded. Notices of default
22	were rescinded.
23	With regards to ETS was simply acting at the
24	instruction of the beneficiary. And there is nothing, within
25	the deed of trust or California statute, to impose a duty upon

```
ETS to diligence the chain of title giving it -- the chain of
 1
 2
    title of the lender who was giving it the authority under the
    ETS -- or I'm sorry, under the substitute of trustee.
 3
 4
             So all we have here is simply ETS taking instructions
    from a party and implementing that through a notice.
 5
 6
             THE COURT: But what -- this is not an evidentiary
 7
    hearing.
             MR. WISHNEW: Right.
 8
             THE COURT: I'm not going to find facts at this
 9
10
    hearing. This, in my view, is the equivalent of a motion to
11
    dismiss. If this was an adversary complaint, this would be the
12
    equivalent of a motion to dismiss. Do you agree with that?
             MR. WISHNEW: I do, and so in that regards, let me
13
                 I'll avoid the facts, but --
14
    jump ahead.
15
             THE COURT: So my question to come back to is, so
    either in the proof of claim -- and the Trust sent the request
16
17
    letter and got a so-called diligence report back --
18
             MR. WISHNEW: Right.
19
             THE COURT: -- from Mr. Moss.
20
             MR. WISHNEW: Right.
21
             THE COURT: And so in either the proof of claim
22
    itself, or in the diligence report that Mr. Moss submitted,
    tell me what is alleged, with respect to ETS, that would or
23
24
    would not meet the requirements of -- just using the Kachlon
```

standard; I won't repeat it.

qualified common interest privilege that protects the trustee's 1 2 actions in pursuing a foreclosure. And --THE COURT: It could be that if a party improperly 3 executes the substitution, the substitute trustee received it 4 in good faith, there may be an action against --5 6 MR. WISHNEW: That's exactly where I was going, Your 7 Honor. The fact of the matter is there could be an action against the beneficiary --8 THE COURT: Right. 9 10 MR. WISHNEW: -- which in this case was ultimately Bank of New York, which Mr. Moss separately sued, and with whom 11 12 he settled. He specifically -- when he settled with BoNY, he 13 carved out ETS. So his claim against ETS is limited to an alleged fiduciary duty that we purportedly violated. 14 15 of --THE COURT: So you become -- when you take on the role 16 17 of substitute trustee, you become the agent for --18 MR. WISHNEW: Correct, Your Honor. You're not a fiduciary --19 20 THE COURT: -- the beneficiary, right? 21 MR. WISHNEW: You're not a fiduciary, and that's 22 exactly what Kachlon says as well. Kachlon specifically says, at 168 Cal. App. 4th 335, "The scope and nature of the 23 24 trustee's duties are exclusively defined by the deed of trust

and the governing statutes. No other common law duties exist."

RESIDENTIAL CAPITAL, LLC, ET AL.

1	Prior to that a sentence prior to that, "The trustee in
2	nonjudicial foreclosure is not a true trustee with fiduciary
3	duties, but rather a common agent for the trustor and
4	beneficiary."
5	THE COURT: Right. So when you're the agent for the
6	trustor or beneficiary, and if you've not acted in good
7	faith
8	MR. WISHNEW: Um-hum.
9	THE COURT: and if you've acted with malice, a
10	claim could be stated against the substitute trustee, correct?
11	MR. WISHNEW: Correct, but
12	THE COURT: Okay. So the question, to my mind, and
13	that's what I want you to address, is what are the specific
14	allegations made, either in the proof of claim or in the
15	diligence report? Do they assert malice? And I don't
16	think a conclusory allegation of malice, without something
17	to back it up, probably wouldn't be enough. And
18	MR. WISHNEW: Um-hum.
19	THE COURT: a conclusory allegation of reckless
20	disregard, that naked allegation
21	MR. WISHNEW: Sure.
22	THE COURT: I don't think is enough. But I thought
23	that Mr. Moss does allege reckless disregard on the part of
24	ETS.
25	MR. WISHNEW: So Your Honor, I'll refer Your Honor to

eScribers, LLC | (973) 406-2250 operations@escribers.net | www.escribers.net

Mr. Moss' response, docketed at 7667, and specifically, I
believe, Exhibit 1, which is his complaint against ETS, filed
in the Superior Court of California, in and for the County of
San Mateo.

THE COURT: Right, and that's incorporated into the proof of claim, isn't it?

MR. WISHNEW: That's -- I believe so. And specifically, the fourth cause of action, that begins on page 10, titled, "The intentional infliction of emotional distress". To follow up on Your Honor's point, I would argue that these are simply naked conclusory allegations. And I'll read them into the record as follows.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. WISHNEW: Paragraph 56, "Defendant's conduct, as herein above set forth, was intentional and malicious and done for the purpose of causing plaintiff to suffer humiliation, mental anguish, and emotional physical distress. Defendant's conduct, in confirming and ratifying the conduct, was done with knowledge that plaintiff's emotional and physical distress would thereby increase, and was done with a wanton and reckless disregard of the consequences to plaintiff."

So certainly he -- Mr. Moss makes a point to include all the key terms, but doesn't necessarily back up those terms with any factual allegations to connect A to B and show how a specific act actually constitutes humiliation or was not done

1 in good faith.

THE COURT: Let's put aside, for a second -- because whether Mr. Moss could state a claim for intentional or negligent infliction of emotional distress is a separate issue, as far as I'm concerned.

MR. WISHNEW: Sure.

THE COURT: What I'm focusing on is whether his allega -- well, put aside whether the allegations -- standing alone, the naked allegations are sufficient, but would you agree that a borrower in California, who stated facts, either in a complaint or in a proof of claim, that could support a plausible claim of reckless disregard on the part of the trustee, the substitute trustee, would have stated a claim for negligence?

MR. WISHNEW: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. So let me ask you this. So you pointed to the paragraphs where he utters the words about wanton and willful and reckless. Would you agree that those allegations -- I'm not getting into whether they're sufficient or not.

MR. WISHNEW: Okay.

THE COURT: Okay? But let's assume they had something to back it up, that that would be sufficient to allege that the substitute trustee had not acted in good faith, if he acted willfully, wanton, recklessly.

```
MR. WISHNEW: I don't -- no, Your Honor, I would not
 1
 2
    agree that a conclusory allegation, on its face, is sufficient
 3
    to state a claim.
 4
             THE COURT: I'm not disagreeing with that.
 5
             MR. WISHNEW: Okay.
 6
             THE COURT: Okay?
 7
             MR. WISHNEW:
                           Okay.
             THE COURT: I want to deal with the issue of, well,
 8
 9
    there's maybe a naked allegation of willful, wanton, reckless,
10
    et cetera.
11
             MR. WISHNEW: Sure.
                                  Sure.
12
             THE COURT: We'll get to the issue of whether that's
13
    sufficient or not. But what must a borrower allege to
14
    sufficiently raise an issue of fact of the trustee's lack of
    good faith under 2924?
15
             MR. WISHNEW: So looking to -- turning back to
16
17
    Kachlon, Your Honor, at page 336, it says, "for this
18
    purpose" -- and this is talking about the qualified privilege
19
    and the malicious exception. I know, Your Honor, it's not good
    faith, but I'll address just this point. "Malice is defined as
20
21
    actual malice, meaning. 'that the publication was motivated by
22
    hatred or ill will towards the plaintiff or by a showing that
    the defendant lacked reasonable grounds for belief in the truth
23
24
    of the publication and therefore acted in reckless disregard of
```

the plaintiff's rights.'"

```
So, Your Honor, I would say that, in that regard,
 1
 2
    there's been no such allegations to substantiate such a
    heightened allegation against ETS. ETS simply published a
 3
 4
    notice at the instruction of the lender.
             THE COURT: Well, it wasn't the lender, but --
 5
 6
             MR. WISHNEW: Well, okay, that's a separate cause of
 7
    action against BoNY, which has been resolved --
             THE COURT: Correct.
 8
             MR. WISHNEW: -- that's being settled with --
 9
10
             THE COURT: Correct.
11
             MR. WISHNEW: -- with Mr. Moss. So in terms of what's
12
    before, Your Honor, I think the Kachlon court lays it out
13
    pretty clearly, and that's --
14
             THE COURT: Look, in order to assert the claim against
15
    substitute trustee for publishing the notice of default and
    then conducting a sale, he'd have to plead and prove a lack of
16
    good faith on the part of ETS and, at a minimum, that it acted
17
    either with ill will or with reckless disregard for the truth,
19
    correct?
             MR. WISHNEW: Correct, Your Honor.
20
21
             THE COURT: So what's -- I'm obviously going to give
22
    Mr. Moss an opportunity --
23
             MR. WISHNEW: Yes.
24
             THE COURT: -- to respond. But I certainly don't read
25
    what I referred to already as the naked allegations of wanton,
```

willful, reckless. They're completely conclusory and clearly
aren't sufficient. And I have some real doubts whether he can
ever assert sufficient facts to attach those conclusory labels
to. But ordinarily, if this were an adversary proceeding and
he had made a motion to dismiss
MR. WISHNEW: Right.
THE COURT: unless, on the face of the pleading, I
concluded that the plaintiff could state no facts that would
assert a possible claim, I would dismiss it with leave to
amend.
MR. WISHNEW: Right.
THE COURT: And because this is not an evidentiary
hearing, would that same standard apply to an objection to
proof of claim, I would sustain the objection with leave to
amend.
MR. WISHNEW: Well, in that regard
THE COURT: He's at least put you look, he put the
Trust he put the debtors and then the Trust on notice.
MR. WISHNEW: Um-hum.
THE COURT: It's not like he's come up with he's
not seeking to amend the claim, as we sometimes
MR. WISHNEW: Yes.
THE COURT: have
MR. WISHNEW: Yes.
THE COURT: with some new theory.

1	MR. WISHNEW: Um-hum.
2	THE COURT: He's asserted the theory. I've held
3	repeatedly that the Rule 8 and Rule 9 if
4	triggered pleading standards apply in evaluating a proof of
5	claim.
6	MR. WISHNEW: Um-hum.
7	THE COURT: Okay. So the issue is, when do I look at
8	it and say he's raised the theory but not sufficiently pleaded
9	the claim. I can't make factual findings now?
10	If he had something in the proof of claim or in his
11	complaint that he had filed in state court
12	MR. WISHNEW: Um-hum.
13	THE COURT: that on the face of it excluded the
14	possibility that ETS had in its conduct, was reckless,
15	willful, malicious, end of discussion.
16	MR. WISHNEW: Right.
17	THE COURT: But that's what I'm struggling with, Mr.
18	Wishnew.
19	MR. WISHNEW: So to go back to the motion to dismiss
20	analogy, Your Honor, our initial objection is akin to a motion
21	to dismiss. Mr and in this case, it was counted twice,
22	because we wanted to make sure that we addressed the merits of
23	his
24	THE COURT: Yes.
25	MR. WISHNEW: of his complaint against ETS. So we

1	filed the objection; we filed a supplemental objection. That's
2	our complaint. He files his response, which is his answer.
3	And in the claims context, he's given an opportunity
4	to well, sorry. Let me take a step back.
5	In filing our objection, we believe we adequately
6	shifted the proof burden to him to then prove back to us by
7	THE COURT: Tell me, what did you what evidence did
8	you put before me to establish that ETS acted in good faith and
9	without reckless disregard for Mr. Moss' rights?
10	MR. WISHNEW: I
11	THE COURT: You utter the words.
12	MR. WISHNEW: Sure.
13	THE COURT: They're as conclusory as Mr. Moss' words.
14	MR. WISHNEW: Sure.
15	THE COURT: But did you if you come forward if
16	you come forward in your objection with competent evidence, you
17	shift the burden
18	MR. WISHNEW: Um-hum.
19	THE COURT: to Moss. So what evidence I still
20	don't understand how it got so screwed up that the substituted
21	service servicer gets done, but it did.
22	MR. WISHNEW: Right.
23	THE COURT: There's no question that you rescinded the
24	sale.
25	MR. WISHNEW: Yes.

1	THE COURT: That's a separate set of issues that comes
2	about because of it.
3	MR. WISHNEW: Correct.
4	THE COURT: And it may be that the result is no harm
5	no foul at the end of the day.
6	MR. WISHNEW: That's certainly our position.
7	THE COURT: What evidence has the Trust put before me
8	that it acted in good faith without reckless disregard? That's
9	what you need to shift the burden. Do you agree that you need
10	to put in evidence you have to put in competent evidence
11	before you shift the burden to the other side, right?
12	MR. WISHNEW: Well, I think that yes, there has to
13	be there has to be a colorable to shift the burden back
14	to Mr. Moss to prove his claim by a preponderance of the
15	evidence, we certainly have to raise one or more grounds to
16	show why the claim is invalid.
17	THE COURT: You could assert one or more legal
18	grounds, and if that presented a pure legal issue for the
19	Court, I could decide the legal issue.
20	MR. WISHNEW: Right.
21	THE COURT: But you've agreed with me what the
22	standard is in California
23	MR. WISHNEW: Um-hum.
24	THE COURT: for a borrower to assert a claim
25	against the substitute servicer.

1	MR. WISHNEW: Right.
2	THE COURT: Right?
3	MR. WISHNEW: Yes.
4	THE COURT: And my question is, what evidence as
5	opposed to argument, have you placed before the Court that, in
6	your view, shifts the burden to Mr. Moss that he failed to then
7	carry his burden?
8	MR. WISHNEW: From a factual standpoint, I don't know
9	that we put in specifically put in evidence on the issue of
10	good faith. We were rather utilizing our objection to
11	demonstrate from a legal standpoint that there wasn't a legal
12	basis for any claim against the trustee.
13	THE COURT: But you agree that if ETS did not act in
14	good faith, and if it satisfied I'll just use the "malice",
15	but it means perhaps reckless disregard that a claim a
16	negligence claim could be
17	MR. WISHNEW: Could go forward.
18	THE COURT: could go forward.
19	MR. WISHNEW: Not that just to be clear, it could
20	go forward to ultimately be proven by Mr. Moss
21	THE COURT: Absolutely; absolutely.
22	MR. WISHNEW: but it would not be dispositive of
23	any liability.
24	THE COURT: Absolutely. I agree a hundred percent
25	with that.

1	MR. WISHNEW: I just wanted to make sure Mr. Moss
2	THE COURT: No, no, no. You're not giving anything
3	away.
4	MR. WISHNEW: Right.
5	THE COURT: Okay? I hope Mr. Moss understands that.
6	MR. WISHNEW: Right.
7	THE COURT: To me, this is today's issue is a
8	pleading case.
9	MR. WISHNEW: Yes.
10	THE COURT: And if perhaps the Trust had been able to
11	put in competent evidence to show that support good faith,
12	absence of reckless disregard, that could well shift have
13	shifted the burden to Mr. Moss. And if he didn't carry his
14	burden, that could be the end of the story. But what it seems
15	to me, is what I'm faced with is the equivalent to the motion
16	to dismiss.
17	MR. WISHNEW: Um-hum.
18	THE COURT: It's a pleading case.
19	MR. WISHNEW: That's right, Your Honor.
20	THE COURT: And okay.
21	MR. WISHNEW: I mean, ultimately, Your Honor, it's
22	your judgment whether or not on the face of the proof of claim
23	and the diligence response Mr. Moss put in, there's even a
24	scintilla of a reasonable factual allegation to support a lack
25	of good faith between and argue that between the informal

diligence response procedure that the Borrowers Trust and the 1 2 debtors put in place as well as the ability to respond and 3 supplement the record to substantiate such facts. Mr. Moss 4 hasn't done that. But --5 THE COURT: So let me ask this. And this goes beyond anything that's before me today, and maybe you don't know at 6 7 this point. What is it that triggered the Trust to rescind the notice of sale? Are you able to tell me today? Recognizing 8 it's -- won't be dispositive, because it's not a fact 9 10 hearing --11 MR. WISHNEW: One moment. Let me just confer with my 12 colleague for a moment. 13 THE COURT: Okay. 14 (Pause) MR. WISHNEW: Just standing here, Your 15 Honor -- standing here this morning, Your Honor, I'm not 16 17 entirely certain, for the reason it is. 18 THE COURT: All right. That's -- you know. It -- I'm not making any decision on the issues of law --19 20 MR. WISHNEW: Sure. 21 THE COURT: -- at this point, other than it appears to 22 me from a pleading standard is satisfied a claim could go 23 forward. In looking at some of the cases, it does appear to me 24 that the California courts have rejected any obligation on the

substitute servicer to do its own due diligence if those --

25

```
MR. WISHNEW: I wholeheartedly agree with Your Honor.
 1
             THE COURT: Okay. That's not today's issue, but --
 2
 3
             MR. WISHNEW: Right.
 4
             THE COURT: -- that's what it looked like to me.
 5
             MR. WISHNEW: Yes.
 6
             THE COURT: So the questions I had, the factual
 7
    questions, something triggered ETS to rescind the notice of
           What it was, I don't know. When it happened, I don't
 8
    know. So if a borrower sees this notice of default,
 9
10
    sees -- and sees who has done this or how did they become the
11
    servicer --
12
             MR. WISHNEW: Yeah.
13
             THE COURT: -- the assignment's improper. If they
    called ETS or sent a letter to ETS and said this is wrong,
14
15
    they're not my lender, they're not the mortgagee, they can't
    do -- what have they assigned? They didn't have any right to
16
17
    assign. And perhaps that puts the servicer on some duty of
18
    inquiry to find out, well, is there a basis. The servicer, it
19
    seems to me, goes forward at its own risk, at that point, if it
20
    goes forward with the sale.
21
             I think -- all right, let me hear from Mr. Moss.
22
    Okay? But before we do that, do you want to address any of the
    other causes of action that --
23
             MR. WISHNEW: Your Honor --
24
25
             THE COURT: -- intentional or --
```

```
MR. WISHNEW: -- the Court's --
 1
 2
             THE COURT: -- or negligent infliction of emotional
 3
    distress?
 4
             MR. WISHNEW: -- the Court's always well prepared,
    Your Honor. And I know you've read everything we've submitted,
 5
 6
    so I'll just rely on the papers.
 7
             THE COURT: All right. Okay. Okay.
             Mr. Moss, do you want to go ahead?
 8
             MR. MOSS: Thank you, Your Honor. First of all -- and
 9
10
    I think I addressed it in my papers, but just to highlight,
    after listening to your discussion just now, I think I have
11
12
    sufficiently alleged malice and lack of good faith in the
13
    complaint which was --
14
             THE COURT: Mr. Moss --
15
             MR. MOSS: -- it has -- yes?
             THE COURT: -- Mr. Moss, you have not. You have not.
16
17
    You have naked allegations about malice with no facts
18
    whatsoever to back it up. So I'll tell you right now, the only
19
    thing I'm deciding is whether to sustain the objection with
    leave to amend and have you file an amended claim that
20
21
    provides -- that puts some meat on the claim to support -- you
22
    can't simply say they acted maliciously and with reckless
    disregard for the truth. That -- that doesn't -- or without
23
24
    good faith. That's a conclusory allegation. That is not
25
    sufficient to state a claim under California law.
```

RESIDENTIAL CAPITAL, LLC, ET AL.

So the issue for me is, what have you got? Maybe you can tell me this. This is not an evidentiary hearing, but how is it -- what happened that led ETS to rescind the sale? I mean, when you learned of the substitution or the notice of default, did you contact ETS and said this is all wrong? You don't -- what did you do and when?

MR. MOSS: Excuse me. Well, this is part of discovering the facts surrounding the foreclosure and whether it was proper or not. In my lawsuit against BoNY, which litigation went on for three-and-a-half years, and during that litigation, it was -- I attempted to ascertain what happened in the substitution of trustee to ETS. And I can tell you that throughout those three-and-a-half years, the -- BoNY's attorneys, which is actually in their name, but it was actually GMAC who was the servicer throughout all this -- through almost all of this, I should say, never admitted that ETS was wrongfully substituted. That that omission now happened here in your court, is based on public records which I couldn't get GMAC to do initially over those three years --

THE COURT: But their -- Mr. Moss? Mr. Wishnew's acknowledgement on the record today that the initial substitution of trustee was not properly authorized doesn't get you anywhere. Okay? Because in order to assert a -- it may -- you settled your claim against BoNY. That's gone. The issue is, do you have a claim against the Trust? And in order

to have a claim against the Trust, under California law, you are required to show an absence of good faith on ETS's part, and you have to show malice by ETS. Okay?

And my question to you is, you litigated for a number of years in California. What, if any, facts do you believe you can allege in good faith to support an allegation that ETS did not act in good faith, and acted with willful and wanton misconduct with malice or reckless disregard? What facts do you believe you can allege in good faith to support the conclusion that you assert in the complaint -- in the claim now? That's what I want to know.

Because I'm deciding whether to allow you leave to amend. If all you give me back is more of the same, a naked conclusion that ETS acted not with good faith and with malice, that's not going to do it. So it's not as if -- and you don't get discovery to be able to plead a good claim. You've had discovery; you've had litigation; you settled the claim with BoNY after a long time.

What facts do you believe you can allege in good faith to support a claim or your claims against ETS?

MR. MOSS: Well, thank you, Your Honor. I -- and that puts me in a somewhat difficult position, I will readily admit, because my -- the availability of such facts to me are limited without any kind of discovery.

THE COURT: Well, you --

MR. MOSS: I think I if I I think that the
complaint that I filed against ETS was sufficient under state
law to survive what we call here a demurrer to proceed with
discovery to find out further facts. What I know is, under
California law, not Kachlon, but other cases I've cited in my
brief, that they were at least negligent. And in not
fulfilling their duties as a trustee to me, as is required
THE COURT: They're not a trustee to you.
MR. MOSS: I can
THE COURT: Mr. Moss, they're not a trustee to you.
MR. MOSS: No, they absolutely are a trustee.
THE COURT: Look, I've read the California Mr.
Moss, I read the California cases. I know what the standard
is. I believe that Kachlon properly sets forth the standard.
That same standard is essentially set forth in the Perez v.
Wells Fargo case in the Northern District of California in
2011.
Are you a lawyer, Mr. Moss?
MR. MOSS: I am a lawyer.
THE COURT: Okay. I thought so because you're you
filed substantial arguments and pleadings. You don't have to
be a lawyer to appear here, but it seemed to me from reading
your papers that you are a lawyer.
And all right, look. Here's what's going to
happen. I'm going to enter an order sustaining the Trust's

objections to the Moss claim without prejudice and with leave to amend within thirty days.

MR. MOSS: Okay.

THE COURT: In order to state a claim, that is not barred by Civil Code Section 2924 and Civil Code Section 47, Mr. Moss must state facts that establish a plausible claim that ETS acted not in good faith and acted with malice as that term is expanded upon in the Kachlon decision. I've read it into the record once. I won't repeat it now. Kachlon is at 168 Cal.App.4th 316. It's a Second -- California Second District Appellate decision from 2008.

That amended claim must be filed within thirty days. And Mr. Wishnew, I'll give the Trust thirty days after the amended claim is filed, whenever that's filed, to assert any new objection. If you do, I would request that you work out the remaining briefing and hearing schedule with Mr. Moss. Okay?

But you've got thirty days to file an amended claim; the Trust has thirty days to file any renewed objection, and Mr. Wishnew and Mr. Moss, you'll confer about how much time Mr. Moss should have to respond, and you'll work out what hearing date it would be scheduled for.

MR. WISHNEW: Very good, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right? And an order will be entered sustaining the objection without prejudice and with leave to

1	amend within thirty days, for the reasons stated on the record
2	during today's hearing. Okay?
3	Thank you, Mr. Moss.
4	MR. MOSS: Thank you.
5	THE COURT: All right, Mr. Wishnew. Let's move on to
6	the next matter.
7	MR. WISHNEW: Thank you, Your Honor. Jordan Wishnew,
8	Morrison & Foerster for the ResCap Liquidating Trust. Moving
9	on to item 2, on page 9 of today's agenda, the ResCap
10	Liquidating Trust's seventy-ninth omnibus claims objection.
11	This deals with one claim, a carry-over from the first hearing.
12	That is the claim of Martha Panaszewicz. I think some a
13	representative for her might be on the phone, Your Honor.
14	THE COURT: Yeah. Is someone appearing on the
15	telephone for Ms. Panaszewicz.
16	MR. ROSARIO: Yes, Your Honor. My name is John
17	Rosario. I'm appearing for Ms. Panaszewicz.
18	THE COURT: Just spell your last name for me?
19	MR. ROSARIO: That's R-O-S-A-R-I-O, Your Honor.
20	THE COURT: All right. Mr. Rosario, I believe you
21	spoke with one of my law clerks earlier today. Am I correct in
22	that?
23	MR. ROSARIO: That's correct, Your Honor.
24	THE COURT: All right. And what my law clerk, I
25	believe, communicated to you is you had as I understand, had

RESIDENTIAL CAPITAL, LLC, ET AL.

not yet been retained by Ms. Panaszewicz, and I had my law
clerk communicate that the only way you would be permitted to
argue at the hearing today, is if you state on the record that
you will promptly file a notice of appearance on Ms.
Panaszewicz's behalf. Are you do you represent that on the
record, now?
MR. ROSARIO: Yes, I do, Your Honor.
THE COURT: And I take it, Mr. Rosario, that you're a
member of the bar in the Southern District?
MR. ROSARIO: Yes, I am, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Okay. All right. I don't want to be
difficult it's not my intention to be difficult about it,
but it wouldn't be the first time that somebody had argued on
behalf of a party in a proceeding before me, and then lo and
behold, they don't file an appearance, they say I was never
retained. And so I don't whenever I try to be
respectful, and I didn't require that you file the notice of
appearance before you get on the phone. And ordinarily, I
don't permit counsel whose office is in the New York
metropolitan area to appear by telephone, but sometimes I do,
and under the circumstances I understand your office is in
Queens, and this is a matter that had just come up.
So I accept your representation that you will promptly
file your appearance on Ms. Panaszewicz's behalf.

file your appearance on Ms. Panaszewicz's behalf.

Mr. Wishnew, go ahead.

,	MR. WISHNEW: I guess, Your Honor, without being too
	presumptuous, I was going to go forward and ask for the
	objection to be entered as to Ms. Panaszewicz's claim. But
	given her involvement now of counsel, I'm not quite sure how
	you want to proceed.
	THE COURT: Well
	MR. WISHNEW: Basically, the I was fairly
	straightforward in that we had spoken with Ms. Panaszewicz, she
	had asked for an extension of time to file a response; she did
	not file a response. The matter was simply uncontested, and so
	for the reasons set forth in the objection, we were going to
	ask that the claim be expunded.
	THE COURT: All right. Mr. Rosario, what is it you
	would like to do?
	MR. ROSARIO: That's exactly where we're what I'd
	like to request, Your Honor. If we can be given maybe a week
	to come up with our response to the objection, again, because
	we have only been recently retained.
	THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Wishnew, when's the next
	omnibus day?
	MR. WISHNEW: The 25th, Your Honor. Two weeks.
	THE COURT: Two weeks. And what's the next day after
	that?
	MR. WISHNEW: March 12th, Your Honor or March 11th.
	One of those.

```
THE COURT: March 12th. I'm looking at my calendar,
 1
 2
    Mr. Rosario, so just be patient, okay.
             MR. ROSARIO: Yes.
 3
 4
         (Pause)
             THE COURT: All right. Mr. Rosario, I'm going to give
 5
    you until Wednesday, February 25th at 5 o'clock to file an
 6
 7
    opposition to the objection. And Mr. Wishnew, I'll give the
    Trust until Friday, March 6th at 5 o'clock to file a reply.
 8
    And the matter should be set on the calendar for Thursday,
 9
10
    March 12th at 10 a.m.
11
             MR. WISHNEW: Would you like for us to enter an
12
    order -- or submit a notice to that effect?
13
             THE COURT: Yes.
14
             MR. WISHNEW: Okay.
             THE COURT: Okay? And bear with me a minute. Okay?
15
             Mr. Rosario, the issue posited by the Trust is that
16
17
    Ms. Panaszewicz filed a late claim, purporting to be an
    administrative claim. It was past the -- it's not clear to me
18
19
    that it's an administrative claim -- it's not clear that it
    would be an administrative claims. So you better address the
20
21
    timeliness of the filing of the claim --
22
             MR. ROSARIO: Yes, Your Honor.
             THE COURT: -- whether it is properly asserted as an
23
24
    administrative claim, and --
25
             MR. ROSARIO: Yes, we will do that, Your Honor.
```

1	THE COURT: it appears untimely under either basis.
2	MR. ROSARIO: Yes.
3	THE COURT: Whether assuming it's untimely, whether
4	leave to file a late claim should be given. And an issue not
5	addressed in the Trust's motion but which the Court has looked
6	at and would consider, is whether the action the lawsuit
7	that Ms. Panaszewicz filed in California I believe in
8	California State Court, would be an informal proof of claim. I
9	would note that that complaint was filed after the bar date for
10	administrative claims in any event, so I think it would be a
11	late claim. And it's the Court's understanding that to be an
12	informal proof of claim, it has to be filed in this court, not
13	in another court.
14	I'm raising it because Ms. Panaszewicz was pro se, and
15	I wanted and while she didn't file a response, the Court, in
16	preparing for today's hearing, wanted to be comfortable about
17	the issues that are presented. So I'm just putting it on the
18	record for both sides.
19	I think those were the comments I have for today. So
20	you know what the schedule is, Mr. Rosario?
21	MR. ROSARIO: Yes, Your Honor. I wrote down all the
22	points
23	THE COURT: And it shouldn't take that many pages, but
24	just so we're clear, there's a twenty-five-page limit on any

25 opposition you file. That wouldn't include declarations. But

1	any memorandum of law is limited to a maximum of twenty-five
2	pages. And the Trust's reply, unless the Court expands it, is
3	ten pages. Okay?
4	MR. ROSARIO: Yes, Your Honor. Thank you very much.
5	THE COURT: And just the last thing, Mr. Rosario, you
6	need to appear in person at the hearing, okay?
7	MR. ROSARIO: I understand, Your Honor.
8	THE COURT: I've accommodated you by telephone today,
9	but you need to be here for the meeting. Okay?
10	MR. ROSARIO: Yeah. Thank you again, Your Honor.
11	THE COURT: All right. Thank you very much. All
12	right. So that takes care of Panaszewicz for today.
13	MR. WISHNEW: Thank you, Your Honor. Jordan Wishnew,
14	Morrison & Foerster for the ResCap Borrower Claims Trust. This
15	brings us to the last item on today's agenda, item 3 on page
16	10, the ResCap Borrower Claims Trust's eightieth omnibus
17	objection. Your Honor, through the eightieth omnibus
18	objection, the Borrower Trust seeks to expunge nineteen proofs
19	of claim that did not represent valid pre-petition claims
20	against the debtors, because they do not demonstrate specific
21	wrongdoing by the debtors.
22	The Borrower Trust thoroughly examined the debtors'
23	books and records in an effort to validate the accuracy of the
24	allegations made in the responses in the claims at issue, and

determined that the books and records do not show any liability

due and owing to the respondents.

Responses to the objection were due January 22nd,
2014. The Borrower Trust received three responses to the
objection. And the Borrower Trust is addressing two of those
responses today.

Claim numbers 345 and 3734 filed by Mr. Conrad
Burnett, filed at docket number 7938 and 8036 and claim 1533
filed by Leslie Sullivan, at docket number 7955.

The Borrower Trust anticipated going forward with the claim as to Ms. Nikki Johnson, however we are working to try and resolve that claim consensually, and we'll bring it back before the Court if we're not able to.

THE COURT: All right. So we're adjourning as to Johnson?

MR. WISHNEW: That's correct, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. WISHNEW: The Borrower Trust filed a related reply in support of the objection at docket number 8068. In support of the objection and the reply, the Borrower Trust submitted a supplemental declaration by Kathy Priore, associate counsel to the ResCap Liquidating Trust. Ms. Priore is on the phone today and available to answer any questions the Court might have for her.

Before addressing the responses, Your Honor, I've requested the Court grant the objection as to the uncontested

1	claims on the basis that each uncontested claim fails to
2	identify a valid legal basis for an allowed claim against the
3	debtors.
4	THE COURT: Sustained.
5	MR. WISHNEW: Thank you, Your Honor.
6	THE COURT: You can submit an order to that effect.
7	MR. WISHNEW: Okay. We'll do so, Your Honor.
8	I guess if Your Honor would like to check if anyone is
9	appearing for either Mr. Burnett or Ms. Sullivan?
10	THE COURT: Is anybody appearing for Mr. Burnett? Is
11	anybody appearing for Ms. Sullivan?
12	All right. With respect to Mr. Burnett
13	MR. WISHNEW: Yes, Your Honor.
14	THE COURT: this is not the first time that Burnett
15	has been before the Court. Burnett is represented bear with
16	me by Pablo Bustos. Mr. Bustos previously appeared in this
17	court.
18	Mr. Bustos called my chambers this morning and said he
19	had made a mistake, thought the hearing was this afternoon, and
20	was at a deposition. My courtroom deputy advised Mr. Bustos
21	that the hearing was going forward, whether he was here or not.
22	The hearing is going forward.
23	Bear with me a second.
24	(Pause)
25	THE COURT: The Court has reviewed the filings by Mr.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

RESIDENTIAL CAPITAL, LLC, ET AL.

Bustos. Under Rule 9011(b) of the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy procedure: "By presenting to the court whether by signing, filing, submitting, or later advocating a petition, pleading, written motion, or other paper, an attorney or unrepresented party certifying that to the best of the person's knowledge, information, and belief, formed after an inquiry reasonable under the circumstances: 1) it is not being presented for any improper purpose such as to harass or to cause unnecessary delay or needless increase in the cost of litigation; 2) the claims, defenses, and other legal contentions therein are warranted by existing law or by a nonfrivolous argument for the extension, modification, or reversal of existing law, or the establishment of new law; 3) the allegations and other factual contentions have evidentiary support, or if specifically so identified are likely to have evidentiary support after a reasonable opportunity for further investigation or discovery; and 4) the denials of factual contentions are warranted on the evidence or, if specifically so identified, are reasonably based on a lack of information or belief." Rule 9011(c)(1)(B): On Court's Initiative. On its own initiative, the court may enter an order describing the specific conduct that appears to violate subdivision (b) and

directing an attorney, law firm, or party to show cause why it has not violated subdivision (b) with respect thereto."

The Court is going to enter an order to show cause why

RESIDENTIAL CAPITAL, LLC, ET AL.

Mr. Bustos should not be sanctioned for violating Rule 9011(b) with respect to many of the arguments he has set forth in the pleadings that he's filed in this court, in connection with the objection.

Mr. Bustos submitted his opposition in an unusual form of an answer to a complaint. That's not the basis for my believing that he's violated Rule 9011. Most of the arguments of this blunderbuss pleading that he's filed are absolutely frivolous, have never previously been asserted, are not timely to assert, and the Court has serious questions whether Mr. Bustos has violated Rule 9011 in making his submission, putting the Trust's counsel and the Court to a substantial burden to deal with Mr. Bustos' frivolous arguments.

In a written order to show cause and setting a hearing and a date for Mr. Bustos to respond, I'll also give the Trust an opportunity to file -- the Trust has not filed a 9011 motion. I've read the portion of the rule that permits the Court to raise the issue on its own.

There are a couple of issues that Mr. Bustos raises that I do want to inquire about. So Mr. Bustos argues that the debtors are liable for wrongful foreclosure on the basis that "GMAC appointed a substitute trustee by false notary and robosigning," because "notary Susan Turner was issued a consent order and did not log notarized documents per PA law," and "GMAC employee Jeffery Stephan signed as vice president of MERS

when he was not a board appointed vice president, according to the terms and conditions of the MERS corporate bylaws." This is from the diligence report that was filed.

So the Court is obviously somewhat familiar with Mr. Stephan. Tell me what Mr. Stephan did in connection with the Burnett claim and whether he was properly authorized to do so and whether I have any evidence supporting Bustos' allegation that this was an example of robosigning. So you need to walk me through --

MR. WISHNEW: Absolutely, Your Honor.

THE COURT: -- the facts.

MR. WISHNEW: Absolutely. So first I would refer Your Honor -- Jeffrey Stephan's connection to this claim relates to the substitution of trustee signed on May 9th, 2009. And that is attached as Exhibit B to the diligence response, which the Trust has put in at -- sorry, Your Honor -- Exhibit A, docket number 8068-2. So that's Jeffery Stephan's connection.

Jeffery Stephan's authorization is then substantiated at Exhibit F of 80 -- at docket number 8068-9, specifically there's a corporate resolution which identifies a list of candidates who were employees of GMAC Mortgage LLC, a member of MERS, and appointed as assistant secretaries and vice presidents of MERS, and authorized to undertake certain actions.

And we blacked out the names of those parties other

than Mr. Stephan. And the list is updated as of 4/29 -- April 1 2 29th, 2009. So clearly, at the time he signed the substitution --3 4 THE COURT: And who executed that authorization? MR. WISHNEW: That was authorized by a corporate 5 6 secretary of MERS. The person's name is actually blacked out 7 on the copy we provided on the docket. THE COURT: Is that -- was that also a GMAC employee 8 or was it a MERS employee? 9 10 THE COURT: The corporate secretary of MERS? 11 MR. WISHNEW: Yes. I don't know if they were 12 specifically a GMAC employee. I just -- the representation 13 being made at the end of the document -- and this is page 2 of 6 at 8068-9: "I 'blank' being a corporate secretary of 14 Mortgage Electronic Registration Systems, Inc., here by certify 15 that the foregoing is a true copy of a resolution duly adopted 16 17 by the board of directors of said corporation, effective as of 18 the 17th day of July, 2003, which is in full force and effect 19 on this day, and does not conflict with the certificate of incorporation or bylaws of said corporation." 20 21 THE COURT: So what does that authorize Stephan to do? 22 MR. WISHNEW: It -- there's -- the corporate 23 resolution identifies seven different tasks, including 24 endorsing checks made payable to MERS; taking all actions and

executing all documents necessary to refinance, amend, or

25

1	modify a mortgage loan registered on the MERS system; taking
2	any and all actions an executing all documents necessary to
3	protect the interest of the member, the beneficial owner of
4	such mortgage loan, or MERS in any bankruptcy proceeding
5	regarding a loan registered on the MERS system; executing any
6	and all documents necessary to foreclose upon a property
7	securing any mortgage loan registered on the MERS system that
8	is shown to be registered to the member, including but not
9	limited to substitution of trustee on deed of trust, trustee's
10	deeds upon sale, and other"
11	THE COURT: Just got a little read that again,
12	slower.
13	MR. WISHNEW: I apologize again.
14	THE COURT: No, that just focus on because
15	that's what you're relying on
16	MR. WISHNEW: Yes. Yes, Your Honor.
17	THE COURT: is the authorization to Stephan in the
18	resolution from MERS
19	MR. WISHNEW: Yes, Your Honor.
20	THE COURT: And what does it authorize him to do with
21	respect to substitution of trustee?
22	MR. WISHNEW: Sure. So paragraph 3 of the corporate
23	resolution states: "execute any and all documents necessary to
24	foreclose upon a property securing any mortgage loan registered
25	on the MERS system that is shown to be registered to the

1	member, including but not limited to: a) substitution of
2	trustee on deeds of trust, b) trustee's deeds upon sale on
3	behalf of MERS, c) affidavits of nonmilitary status,
4	d) affidavits of judgment, e) affidavits of debt, f) quitclaim
5	deeds, g) affidavits regarding lost promissory notes, and
6	h) endorsements of promissory notes to VA or HUD on behalf of
7	MERS as a required part of the claims process."
8	THE COURT: All right. And what is it that Mr.
9	Stephan did here with respect to Burnett?
LO	MR. WISHNEW: What he did was ratify a substitution of
L1	trustee to Specialized, Inc. as a substitute trustee
L2	THE COURT: Specialized Inc. of Virginia?
L3	MR. WISHNEW: Yes. And that was the entity that I
L 4	believe pursued the foreclosure against Mr. Burnett.
L5	THE COURT: And substituted Specialized, Inc. of
L6	Virginia in place of whom?
L7	MR. WISHNEW: One moment, Your Honor. Specialized,
L8	Inc. in place of Laura H. Franck, F-R-A-N-C-K. And I'm
L9	referring to docket number 8068-2, which is the Burnett
20	diligence response, page 7 of 30.
21	THE COURT: So Mr. Bustos says, "GMAC employee Jeffery
22	Stephan signed as vice president of MERS when he was not a
23	board appointed vice president, according to the terms and
24	conditions of the MERS corporate bylaws." Has Mr. Bustos put
25	in front of the Court MERS bylaws that purportedly were

1	violated?
2	MR. WISHNEW: He has not, Your Honor.
3	THE COURT: Has he put forward any evidence that Mr.
4	Stephan wasn't properly authorized by the resolution signed by
5	the corporate secretary of MERS to do the substitution that was
6	done?
7	MR. WISHNEW: He has not, Your Honor.
8	THE COURT: It's a naked allegation he's made without
9	any evidence to support it?
10	MR. WISHNEW: Correct, Your Honor.
11	THE COURT: All right. And so who initiated the
12	foreclosure here?
13	MR. WISHNEW: I believe the foreclosure would have
14	been initiated by Specialized, Inc. of Virginia.
15	THE COURT: Who was servicing the loan at the time?
16	MR. WISHNEW: One moment, Your Honor.
17	THE COURT: Okay, I think I misspoke when I said that
18	Bustos submitted the diligence report was submitted pro se
19	by Burnett, just to make clear
20	MR. WISHNEW: Okay.
21	THE COURT: that Bustos didn't submit it. But the
22	point being, I've got to look at the record that's before me.
23	MR. WISHNEW: Um-hum.
24	THE COURT: Bustos has certainly repeated arguments

that have no evidentiary support whatsoever. And I just want

1	to track through
2	MR. WISHNEW: Of course.
3	THE COURT: who did what.
4	MR. WISHNEW: Sure. And Your Honor, to answer your
5	last question, Homecomings Financial serviced the loan from May
6	10th, 2006 until July 1st, 2009, when GMAC Mortgage took over
7	servicing until the foreclosure sorry. So GMAC took over on
8	July 1st, 2009 until the foreclosure on August 19th, 2009.
9	THE COURT: Okay. And Specialized proceeded with the
10	foreclosure. Is that correct?
11	MR. WISHNEW: That's my understanding, Your Honor,
12	yes.
13	THE COURT: Is there any evidence in the record that
14	would support Bustos' allegation that the substitution of
15	trustee was done fraudulently?
16	MR. WISHNEW: No, Your Honor.
17	THE COURT: Were done without authority?
18	MR. WISHNEW: No, Your Honor. I believe that the
19	corporate resolution we referenced specifically counters that
20	point.
21	THE COURT: And that's in the record before me?
22	MR. WISHNEW: That is absolutely in the record, Your
23	Honor.
24	THE COURT: A separate issue raised by the claim.
25	Burnett argues that GMACM breached the terms of a letter dated

RESIDENTIAL CAPITAL, LLC, ET AL.

July 29, 2009 (sic) from GMACM to Burnett. And Burnett said GMACM agreed that Burnett had thirty days until a foreclosure sale would occur.

In your objection, at Exhibit 1 at page 3, you assert that the letter does not state the debtors committed "to put foreclosure steps on hold for thirty days." It appears to the Court that the July 30, 2009 letter which is attached to the diligence report, states in the bottom right corner, "thirty days to sale." And the foreclosure sale was conducted less than thirty days after the July 29th, 2009 (sic) letter. The sale was conducted on August 19th, 2009. What's your position on that?

And I guess the question is, has Burnett raised in his proof of claim and diligence report, an issue that -- where you've not adequately rebutted and shifted the burden back to him? I mean, that note: "thirty days to sale," could plausibly be interpreted as saying you wouldn't foreclose for thirty days. There's nothing in the letter that sets a deadline for Burnett to respond to the GMAC letter. The letter merely states: "It is critical that the enclosed financial analysis form is completed and returned to our office at your earliest opportunity."

So has -- it seems to me -- I'm raising the issue, I'm not drawing a conclusion yet -- it seems to me that perhaps Mr. Burnett has stated a plausible claim that GMACM initiated and

```
completed a foreclosure sale after committing it wouldn't do so
 1
 2
    for thirty days. What's your response?
 3
             MR. WISHNEW: So just to confirm that we're looking at
    the same item, Your Honor. You're referring to a July 30, 2009
 4
    letter.
 5
 6
             THE COURT: July 29th, 2009 letter.
 7
             MR. WISHNEW: July 29th, 2009 letter.
             THE COURT: It's July 30th. I'm sorry.
 8
 9
             MR. WISHNEW: Okay.
10
             THE COURT: July 30th.
11
             MR. WISHNEW: Which is addressed to Conrad P. Burnett.
12
    I think it's docketed at 8068-2, page 6 of 30 -- Exhibit A to
13
    Mr. Burnett's claim response?
14
             THE COURT: Right.
15
             MR. WISHNEW: Okay.
             THE COURT: Is there a note on it, "thirty days to
16
17
    sale"?
18
             MR. WISHNEW: There is a note "thirty days to sale."
    I mean, this is simply a letter, Your Honor, which is -- would
19
    appear to be a last-ditch effort to try and --
20
21
             THE COURT: I understand that.
22
             MR. WISHNEW: Right.
23
             THE COURT: I understand that. But if you send a
    borrower a letter --
24
25
             MR. WISHNEW: Yeah.
```

eScribers, LLC | (973) 406-2250 operations@escribers.net | www.escribers.net

1	THE COURT: dated July 30th, 2009
2	MR. WISHNEW: Yeah.
3	THE COURT: and you say thirty days to sale, does
4	that create an obligation on the part of GMACM not to sell
5	within thirty days?
6	If there were a there's nothing in the letter that
7	says you must respond to this letter within seven days
8	MR. WISHNEW: Um-hum.
9	THE COURT: or whatever any period. It just
10	says I quoted it: "critical that the enclosed financial
11	analysis form is completed and returned to our office at your
12	earliest opportunity." He didn't do that.
13	Again, I'm looking at I don't know whether you
14	shifted the burden back. He says you said you wouldn't
15	foreclose for thirty days, and you did. You foreclosed on
16	August 19th.
17	MR. WISHNEW: You know, I think that for there to be
18	detri an allegation of detrimental reliance, there has to be
19	a fairly clear representation that it was reasonable for Mr.
20	Burnett to rely upon.
21	THE COURT: What is he supposed to make of "thirty
22	days to sale"?
23	MR. WISHNEW: Standing here, Your Honor, there's
24	certainly ambiguity in the letter. I don't know that I would
25	construe it as an indication that

RESIDENTIAL CAPITAL, LLC, ET AL.

1	THE COURT: Would you agree with me that Mr. Burnett
2	has asserted a plausible claim that a foreclosure sale occurred
3	improperly on August 19th, 2009, after GMAC's July 30th, 2009
4	letter stated that "thirty days to sale"? I'm not saying he
5	prevails on the claim
6	MR. WISHNEW: Um-hum.
7	THE COURT: but the only issue for now is, is it a
8	plausible claim? Have you shifted the burden back to him,
9	which I don't think you have? And we see where that piece goes
10	from here.
11	MR. WISHNEW: I think on its face, there was certainly
12	an ambiguity that would create a plausible issue of fact
13	THE COURT: Okay.
14	MR. WISHNEW: to which the Borrower Trust has not
15	yet addressed what the meaning of the term "thirty days to
16	sale" in the footer of the letter, is intended to mean. That's
17	the best I could say right now, Your Honor.
18	THE COURT: Okay, that's fine. That's fine. I'm just
19	skimming through my notes to see whether there's anything else
20	that I want
21	MR. WISHNEW: Of course, Your Honor.
22	THE COURT: to address. There are lots of things
23	we're not going to address.
24	Okay, I'm going to take the Burnett claim objection
25	under submission.

1	MR. WISHNEW: Thank you, Your Honor.
2	THE COURT: And as I said, I am going to issue an
3	order to show cause to Mr. Bustos. Most of what he filed is
4	pure garbage.
5	MR. WISHNEW: Your Honor, there was one other claim,
6	that of Leslie Sullivan.
7	THE COURT: Yes.
8	MR. WISHNEW: I'm not sure you'd like me to present on
9	it just take it under advisement, or
10	THE COURT: Let me just look at my notes, okay?
11	MR. WISHNEW: Sure.
12	THE COURT: I'll take it under submission and enter a
13	separate order.
14	MR. WISHNEW: Very good, Your Honor.
15	THE COURT: Okay. So you're going to submit one order
16	that covers everything as to which no response was filed.
17	MR. WISHNEW: Yes.
18	THE COURT: And the Court will enter orders with
19	respect to Burnett and Sullivan.
20	MR. WISHNEW: Yes.
21	THE COURT: And Johnson is adjourned.
22	MR. WISHNEW: Correct, Your Honor, yes.
23	THE COURT: Okay.
24	MR. WISHNEW: And we'll file that notice concerning
25	the scheduling for the Panaszewicz claim on seventy-ninth omni.

	Pg 76 of 92	
	RESIDENTIAL CAPITAL, LLC, ET AL.	74
1	THE COURT: Yes.	
2	MR. WISHNEW: With that, Your Honor, we are done.	
3	THE COURT: Thank you very much.	
4	MR. WISHNEW: Thank you for your time.	
5	(Whereupon these proceedings were concluded at 11:56 AM)	
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1	INDEX		
2	RULINGS	PAGE	LINE
3	Motion for entry of default judgment	22	6
4	against third-party defendant Ally		
5	Financial, Inc. is denied		
6	Trust's objection to Mr. Moss' claim is	52	1
7	sustained without prejudice and with leave		
8	to amend within thirty days as detailed on		
9	the record.		
10	Eightieth omnibus objection to claims is	60	5
11	sustained as to all uncontested objections.		
12	Order to show cause entered by the Court,	62	1
13	why Mr. Bustos should not be sanctioned for		
14	violating Rule 9011(b) with respect to many		
15	of the arguments he has set forth in the		
16	pleadings that he's filed in this court		
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			

eScribers, LLC | (973) 406-2250 operations@escribers.net | www.escribers.net

1

CERTIFICATION

3

4

5

I, Sharona Shapiro, certify that the foregoing transcript is a true and accurate record of the proceedings.

6

7

8

9

10

11 SHARONA SHAPIRO

Shanna Shaphe

12 AAERT Certified Electronic Transcriber CET**D-492

13

14 eScribers

15 700 West 192nd Street, Suite #607

16 New York, NY 10040

17

18 Date: February 12, 2015

19

20

21

22

23

_ _

24

25



Digitally signed by eScribers LLC DN: cn=eScribers LLC gn=eScribers LLC c=United States I=US e=operations@escribers.net Reason: I attest to the accuracy and integrity of this document

Date: 2015-02-12 11:12-08:00

eScribers, LLC | (973) 406-2250 operations@escribers.net | www.escribers.net

Location:

	16,18,20;38:21	60:19	alleged (7)	54:20;58:6;70:20
#	actually (4)	again (5)	30:10,23;32:23;	appearance (6)
	36:25;49:14,14;	55:17;58:10;	33:2,2;34:14;48:12	9:24;10:12;54:4,
[‡] 607 (1)	64:6	65:11,13;71:13	alleges (2)	15,18,24
4:22	additional (1)	against (30)	30:16,22	appearances (1)
1.22	24:24	4:4;11:4,6;19:20;	Alliance (1)	9:12
6	address (29)	26:5;27:5;30:11,24;	30:5	appeared (3)
	12:1;13:12;14:7,9,	33:9,14;34:5,8,13;	Alliance's (1)	23:16;33:8;60:16
evidenced (1)	22;15:11,12,16;	35:10;36:2;39:3,7,	30:6	appearing (10)
29:20	16:12,14,16,21,22;	14;41:25;43:25;	allow (3)	10:1,14,16;25:1,2;
29.20	17:9,9,10,15;20:9,	44:12:49:9,24,25;	12:10;24:23;50:12	53:14,17;60:9,10,1
\mathbf{A}	10,17;21:21;22:11;	50:1,20;51:2;58:20;	allowed (1)	appears (6)
A	24:21;35:13;38:20;	60:2;66:14	60:2	27:15;31:7;46:21;
1.924 (1)	47:22;56:20;72:22,	against- (1)	Ally (31)	57:1;61:22;69:6
ability (1)	23	2:5	4:5;6:3,3,11;10:5;	Appellate (1)
46:2	addressed (6)	agenda (6)	11:4,7,9,10,21,24;	52:11
able (8)	13:11;41:22;	9:1,2,3;24:9;53:9;	12:2,11,15;13:7,10,	applies (2)
12:11;13:23;	48:10;57:5;70:11;	58:15	22,25;14:3,5,22;	19:14;20:11
25:18;30:23;45:10;	72:15	agent (4)	15:6,7,15;16:7,9,18;	
46:8;50:16;59:12		14:11;34:17;35:3,		apply (2) 40:13;41:4
above (1)	addressing (2)		18:18;19:20;22:15,	
36:15	59:4,24	5	17	appointed (4)
absence (3)	adequately (2)	ago (1)	Ally's (8)	62:22;63:1,22;
28:14;45:12;50:2	42:5;69:15	29:18	12:6;13:3;14:7;	66:23
Absolutely (8)	Adjourned (4)	agree (18)	15:12,13;16:4;17:2;	approach (1)
44:21,21,24;	3:2,8;24:15;73:21	14:14;15:25;17:4;	22:22	24:18
51:11;62:8;63:10,	adjourning (1)	20:20;29:1,24;30:9,	almost (1)	appropriate (2)
12;68:22	59:13	13;32:12;33:10;	49:15	16:11;20:10
accept (1)	Administrative (6)	37:10,18;38:2;43:9;	alone (1)	April (1)
54:23	3:10;56:18,19,20,	44:13,24;47:1;72:1	37:9	64:1
accepted (1)	24;57:10	agreed (6)	alternative (1)	arbitration (8)
15:3	admit (1)	12:9,9;16:15;31:6;	17:10	13:9;18:1,7,8,10,
	50:22	43:21;69:2	always (1)	12,24,24
accommodated (1)	admitted (2)	agreement (15)	48:4	area (1)
58:8	9:16;49:16	11:8,15,22;12:2;	ambiguity (2)	54:20
accomplished (1)	admittedly (1)	13:9;14:5,6,23;	71:24;72:12	ARETT (2)
15:2	31:4	16:18,18;17:8,24;	amend (8)	8:5,9
according (2)	adopted (1)	18:18;23:18;24:15	40:10,15,21;	argue (6)
63:1;66:23	64:16	ahead (11)	48:20;50:13;52:2;	9:17;20:1;25:15;
accuracy (1)	Adv (1)	10:23;12:12;	53:1;64:25	36:10;45:25;54:3
58:23	2:5	18:16;21:1,11;23:9,	amended (4)	argued (1)
cknowledgement (1)				54:13
49:21	Adversary (12)	15;25:21;32:14;	48:20;52:12,14,18	
ect (4)	3:17;4:2;8:16,19,	48:8;54:25	amount (1)	argues (2)
33:9;36:25;44:13;	25;9:8,14;10:17;	akin (1)	27:22	62:20;68:25
50:7	11:1;23:7;32:11;	41:20	analogy (1)	argument (6)
acted (15)	40:4	al (4)	41:20	14:7;18:5;20:12;
30:7;33:10;35:6,9;	advised (3)	2:6;4:3;8:20,21	analysis (2)	26:23;44:5;61:11
37:24,24;38:24;	12:11;23:17;60:20	Alan (3)	69:21;71:11	arguments (9)
39:17;42:8;43:8;	advisement (1)	3:5;7:23;24:14	ancillary (1)	13:11;20:16;
48:22;50:7,14;52:7,7	73:9	allega (1)	13:11	24:17,24;51:21;62:
cting (1)	advocating (1)	37:8	anguish (1)	7,13;67:24
31:23	61:3	allegation (13)	36:17	article (2)
	affidavit (4)	35:16,19,20;38:2,	anticipate (1)	27:19;28:4
ction (13)	13:16;14:25;15:6,	9;39:3;45:24;48:24;	23:21	ascertain (1)
9:15;11:1;19:7,9,	7	50:6;63:7;67:8;	anticipated (1)	49:11
18;33:9,14;34:5,7;	affidavits (4)	68:14;71:18	59:9	aside (2)
36:8;39:7;47:23;	66:3,4,4,5	allegations (12)	apologies (1)	37:2,8
57:6	affiliates (1)	26:9;35:14;36:11,	8:13	assert (14)
ections (6)				
26:21;31:19;34:2;	11:9	24;37:8,9,19;39:2,	apologize (1)	19:13;27:5;30:24;
63:24;64:24;65:2	AFI (3)	25;48:17;58:24;	65:13	35:15;39:14;40:3,9
ects (1)	9:22;21:13,20	61:13	App (2)	43:17,24;49:23;
27:18	aforementioned (1)	allege (6)	29:22;34:23	50:10;52:14;62:10
actual (8)	25:23	35:23;37:23;	appear (5)	69:4
	afternoon (1)	38:13;50:6,9,19	46:23;51:22;	asserted (6)

Case No. 12-12020-mg				February 11, 2015
11,20,22,16,41,2,		DEDNIDDOCK (27)	huina (1)	59.12
11:20;22:16;41:2;	-	BERNBROCK (37)	bring (1) 59:11	58:12
56:23;62:9;72:2	В	6:15;8:24;9:6,9,		careless (1) 29:16
assign (1) 47:17		11;10:4,5,8;15:6,15;	brings (1) 58:15	
	back (19)	16:6,7,13,17,21,24;		carry (2) 44:7;45:13
assigned (1) 47:16	11:8;23:20,20;	17:1,7,12,17,19,21; 18:2,4,6,15,17;19:1,	brought (1) 27:17	*
assignment's (1)	32:15,17;35:17;	3,16,23;20:4,6,8,15,	burden (14)	carry-over (1) 53:11
47:13	36:23;37:23;38:16;	20,22	26:23;42:6,17;	Carson (1)
assistant (1)	41:19;42:4,6;43:13;	best (5)	43:9,11,13;44:6,7;	7:22
63:22	48:18;50:13;59:11;	28:20;30:5,5;61:5;	45:13,14;62:12;	carved (1)
Associate (2)	69:15;71:14;72:8	72:17	69:15;71:14;72:8	34:13
7:24;59:20	background (1) 11:18	better (1)	Burnett (23)	Case (23)
ASSOCIATES (2)	Bank (3)	56:20	59:7;60:9,10,12,	3:19;8:19;9:4;
7:2;9:14	6:3;33:6;34:11	beyond (1)	14,15;63:6;66:9,14,	12:19,19,25;14:13,
assume (1)	Bankruptcy (8)	46:5	19;67:19;68:25;	16,19;15:3;17:14;
37:22	2:16,25;11:25;	blacked (2)	69:1,1,2,13,19,25;	21:4,8;22:1,6,20;
Assuming (2)	13:8;19:5,17;61:1;	63:25;64:6	70:11;71:20;72:1,	29:10,22;34:10;
22:11;57:3	65:4	BLACKWELL (3)	24;73:19	41:21;45:8,18;51:16
assumption (1)	bar (2)	6:18;9:15;10:25	Burnett's (1)	cases (4)
31:14	54:9;57:9	blank' (1)	70:13	19:5;46:23;51:5,
attach (1)	barred (4)	64:14	business (4)	13
40:3	19:9,9;33:19;52:5	blunderbuss (1)	14:11;15:14,16;	cause (9)
attached (3)	bars (1)	62:8	17:2	29:18;33:9;36:8;
31:3;63:15;69:7	19:6	blundering (1)	Bustos (17)	39:6;61:8,23,25;
attempted (1)	based (7)	29:16	60:16,16,18,20;	62:14;73:3
49:11	13:6,8;14:3;29:14;	board (3)	61:1;62:1,5,11,15,	causes (1) 47:23
attorney (2) 61:4,23	30:12;49:18;61:19	63:1;64:17;66:23 BoNY (5)	19,20;66:21,24; 67:18,21,24;73:3	causing (1)
Attorneys (6)	basically (2)	34:12;39:7;49:9,	Bustos' (3)	36:16
6:3,11,19;7:3,12;	13:4;55:7	24;50:18	62:13;63:7;68:14	CC (3)
49:14	basis (7)	BoNY's (1)	bylaws (4)	3:2,8;4:4
August (4)	44:12;47:18;57:1; 60:1,2;62:6,21	49:13	63:2;64:20;66:24,	cell (3)
68:8;69:11;71:16;	bear (4)	books (4)	25	25:8,10,12
72:3	27:17;56:15;	26:9,11;58:23,25		Certain (3)
authority (4)	60:15,23	Borrower (31)	C	8:21;46:17;63:23
29:3;31:8;32:2;	bearing (1)	3:3,4,14,15;24:8,		certainly (9)
68:17	13:14	11,16,20,22;25:23;	Cal (3)	15:8;28:22;36:22;
authorization (3)	become (3)	26:1,4,8,14;27:5;	29:22;33:7;34:23	39:24;43:6,15;
63:18;64:4;65:17	34:16,17;47:10	30:23;37:10;38:13;	CalApp4th (1)	67:24;71:24;72:11
authorize (2)	begin (1)	43:24;47:9;58:14,16,	52:10	certificate (3)
64:21;65:20	8:4	18,22;59:3,4,9,17,	calendar (2)	14:20;19:11;64:19
authorized (5)	begins (1)	19;70:24;72:14	56:1,9	certify (1)
49:22;63:6,23;	36:8	Borrowers (1)	California (19)	64:15
64:5;67:4 availability (1)	behalf (13)	46:1	27:7,16,17;28:6;	certifying (1)
50:23	9:21;10:1,5;16:7;	both (1) 57:18	31:25;36:3;37:10; 43:22;46:24;48:25;	61:5 cetera (1)
available (2)	20:24;21:13;23:5;	bottom (1)	50:1,5;51:5,12,13,	38:10
26:18;59:22	28:25;54:5,14,24;	69:8	16;52:10;57:7,8	chain (2)
Avenue (1)	66:3,6 behold (1)	Bowling (1)	call (3)	32:1,1
6:4	54:15	2:17	13:11;25:18;51:3	chambers (3)
avoi (1)	belief (3)	breach (1)	called (2)	8:15;24:2;60:18
21:6	38:23;61:6,19	13:25	47:14;60:18	chambers' (1)
avoid (2)	believes (1)	breached (1)	can (19)	8:6
21:24;32:14	22:15	68:25	14:14;15:5,25;	chance (3)
avoidance (2)	believing (1)	brief (6)	18:7,24;19:22;23:6;	10:18;25:15,16
21:4,8	62:7	12:15,19;13:11;	25:9,10,14;40:2;	Chapter (1)
avoided (2)	beneficial (1)	14:13,24;51:6	49:2,12;50:6,9,19;	11:13
11:21;13:24	65:3	briefing (2)	51:9;55:16;60:6	check (1)
aware (1)	beneficiary (8)	24:23;52:16	candidates (1)	60:8
19:5	27:21;28:23,25;	briefly (1)	63:21	checked (1)
away (1)	31:24;34:8,20;35:4,6	26:24	Capital (1)	25:3
45:3	BENJAMIN (2)	briefs (1)	8:3	checks (1)
	6:24;10:25	21:3	care (1)	64:24

Case No. 12-12020-mg
Chicago (1)
6:13 Chief (4)
7:20;15:12,14; 26:15
Circuit (2) 12:18,20
circumstances (3) 27:4;54:21;61:7
cite (2)
12:19;14:15 cited (2)
14:13;51:5 City (3)
6:22;9:16;11:1 Civil (8)
14:18;27:16,16, 17;28:6;33:21;52:5,
5 Claim (104)
3:5,11;11:2,16; 13:4,6,14,19,19,20,
20;14:2,8;20:11;
24:13,14,15;26:5; 27:5;28:9;30:9,11,
16,22,24;31:1,1,3; 32:16,21;33:18,19;
34:13;35:10,14; 36:6;37:3,11,12,13;
38:3;39:14;40:9,14, 21;41:5,9,10;43:14,
16,24;44:12,15,16;
45:22;46:22;48:20, 21,25;49:24,25;50:1,
10,16,17,20;52:1,4,6, 12,14,18;53:11,12;
55:3,12;56:17,18,19, 21,24;57:4,8,11,12;
58:19;59:6,7,10,11; 60:1,2;63:6,13;
68:24;69:14,25; 70:13;72:2,5,8,24;
73:5,25
claimant (2) 25:25;26:12
claimants (1) 10:15
claiming (1) 13:21
Claims (32) 3:3,3,4,5,9,10,14,
15,15;7:20;8:17; 11:22;13:24;24:8,11,
12;26:3,5,10,15;
42:3;50:20;53:10; 56:20;57:10;58:14,
16,19,24;60:1;61:10; 66:7
classic (1) 13:20
clause (4) 13:9;18:7,8,10
clear (9)

,,	,
14:13;21:19;33:7;	
44:19;56:18,19;	
57:24;67:19;71:19 clearly (4)	
13:13;39:13;40:1;	
64:2	
clerk (5) 12:4;19:20,21;	
53:24;54:2	
clerks (1)	
53:21 clerk's (2)	
13:15;19:11	
cloudy (1) 22:10	
Code (7)	
27:16,16,17;28:6;	
33:21;52:5,5 colleague (1)	
46:12	
colorable (1)	
43:13 comfortable (1)	
57:16	
coming (1) 19:12	
comments (2)	
21:9;57:19	
committed (1) 69:5	
committing (1)	
70:1 common (3)	
34:1,25;35:3	
communicate (1)	
54:2 communicated (1)	
53:25	
communications (1) 28:5	
Company (2)	
3:18;23:15	
compel (3) 17:25;18:12,24	
competent (3)	
42:16;43:10;45:11	
complaint (24) 11:4,6,20,25;	
12:25;14:9,21,22;	
16:23;18:23;19:25 20:2;30:9;32:11;	;
36:2;37:11;41:11,	
25;42:2;48:13;	
50:10;51:2;57:9; 62:6	
completed (3)	
69:21;70:1;71:11	
completely (1) 40:1	
comply (1)	
13:14	

concede (1)

17:12

```
Pq 81 of 92
    concept (1)
       29:17
    concerned (3)
       18:9;22:7;37:5
    concerning (1)
       73:24
    concession (1)
       20:18
    conclude (1)
       22:12
    concluded (2)
       40:8;74:5
    conclusion (3)
       50:10,14;69:24
    conclusory (8)
       35:16,19;36:11;
       38:2;40:1,3;42:13;
       48:24
    conditions (2)
       63:2;66:24
    conduct (5)
       36:14,18,18;
       41:14:61:22
    conducted (2)
       69:9,11
    conducting (1)
       39:16
    confer (2)
       46:11;52:20
    Conference (1)
       3:19
    confirm (1)
       70:3
    confirmed (1)
       19:5
    confirming (1)
       36:18
    conflict (1)
       64:19
    connect (1)
       36:24
    connection (5)
       27:6;62:3;63:5,13,
       17
    Conrad (2)
       59:6;70:11
    consensually (1)
       59:11
    consent (1)
       62:23
    consequences (3)
       29:21:30:18:36:21
    consider (4)
       12:20;16:1;18:12;
       57:6
    constitute (2)
       28:4;29:19
    constitutes (2)
       14:18;36:25
    construe (1)
```

```
contact (1)
  49:5
contacted (1)
  12:6
contains (1)
  19:6
contemplate (1)
  18:20
contemplated (1)
  18:19
contentions (3)
  61:10,14,17
context (1)
  42:3
continues (1)
  19:13
contract (7)
  11:11;13:23,25;
  17:15,22;18:7,10
contractual (1)
  14:17
contractually (2)
  16:15:17:4
contravention (1)
  19:18
coordinated (1)
  24:22
copy (4)
  11:25;24:2;64:7,
corner (1)
  69:8
corporate (10)
  63:2,20;64:5,10,
  14,22;65:22;66:24;
  67:5;68:19
CORPORATION (5)
  2:6;4:3;9:7;64:17,
  20
cost (1)
  61:9
counsel (14)
  7:24;9:16;12:6;
  13:17;15:12,14;
  16:4;21:23;22:22;
  23:1;54:19;55:4;
  59:20;62:12
counted (1)
  41:21
counters (1)
  68:19
County (1)
  36:3
couple (2)
  13:10;62:19
course (2)
  68:2;72:21
Court (312)
  2:16;8:2,7,11,14,
  18;9:1,4,8,10,12,18,
  23;10:3,7,9,11,16,20,
```

22;11:17;12:20;

15:17,20,24,25;16:3,

```
11,15,20,22,25;17:4,
  8.14.18.20.25:18:3.5.
  7,11,12,16,20,22;
  19:2,8,18,22,24;
  20:5,7,9,17,21,23;
  21:1,2,5,6,8,11;22:2,
  3,5,6,15;23:1,9,12,
  14,17,24;24:5,17;
  25:1,6,8,10,13,18,21;
  26:18,23;27:1,4,11,
  14,15;28:1,8,13,16,
  18;29:1,7,10,12,12;
  30:2,4,4,14,21;31:6,
  10,12,14,17;32:6,9,
  15,19,21;33:5,13,16,
  18,18,23;34:3,9,16,
  20;35:5,9,12,19,22;
  36:3,5,13;37:2,7,16,
  22;38:4,6,8,12;39:5,
  8,10,12,14,21,24;
  40:7,12,17,20,23,25;
  41:2,7,11,13,17,24;
  42:7,11,13,15,19,23;
  43:1,4,7,17,19,21,24;
  44:2,4,5,13,18,21,24;
  45:2,5,7,10,18,20;
  46:5,13,18,21;47:2,
  4,6,13,25;48:2,7,14,
  16;49:18,20;50:25;
  51:8,10,12,20;52:4,
  24;53:5,14,18,20,24;
  54:8,11;55:6,13,19,
  22;56:1,5,13,15,23;
  57:1,3,5,8,12,13,15,
  23;58:2,5,8,11;
  59:12,13,16,22,25;
  60:4,6,10,14,15,17,
  25,25;61:2,21,25;
  62:3,10,12,18;63:4,
  11;64:4,8,10,21;
  65:11,14,17,20;66:8,
  12,15,21,25;67:3,8,
  11,15,17,21,24;68:3,
  9,13,17,21,24;69:7;
  70:6,8,10,14,16,21,
  23;71:1,3,9,21;72:1,
  7,13,18,22;73:2,7,10,
  12,15,18,18,21,23;
  74:1,3
courtroom (1)
  60:20
courts (2)
  22:7;46:24
Court's (7)
  18:9;23:7,22;48:1,
  4;57:11;61:20
covers (1)
  73:16
create (2)
  71:4;72:12
```

71:25

7:22

Consultants (1)

creditor (1)

11:16

critical (2)

Case No. 12-12020-ing	1	T	T	Tebruary 11, 2015
69:20;71:10	57:25	50:22;54:12,12	40:2	62:25;64:8,9,12;
cutting (1)	deed (7)	diligence (13)	down (1)	66:21
25:13	27:5,23;30:24;	32:1,17,22;35:15;	57:21	employees (1)
	31:2,25;34:24;65:9	45:23;46:1,25;63:3,	drawing (1)	63:21
D	deeds (5)	15;66:20;67:18;	69:24	enclosed (2)
	31:21;65:10;66:2,	69:8,14	Drennan (1)	69:20;71:10
Dabirs (1)	2,5	directing (1)	8:20	end (4)
12:19	Default (32)	61:23	due (4)	41:15;43:5;45:14;
damages (1)	4:4;9:10;11:3,17;	directors (1)	26:11;46:25;59:1,	64:13
33:4	12:4,5,14,21;13:1,2,	64:17	2	endorsements (1)
date (3)	5,15,18;14:8;19:10,	disagree (1)	duly (1)	66:6
52:22;57:9;62:15	11,12,21,23,25;	33:11	64:16	endorsing (1)
dated (2)	21:20;22:6,18,21,24;	disagreeing (1)	during (2)	64:24
68:25;71:1	27:6,22;30:8;31:21;	38:4	49:10;53:2	enough (2)
David (1)	39:15;47:9;49:5	discovering (1)	duties (4)	35:17,22
12:19	Defendant (4)	49:8	34:24,25;35:3;	ensure (1)
day (5)	4:5;12:24;23:20;	discovery (5)	51:7	24:17
43:5;55:20,22;	38:23	50:16,17,24;51:4; 61:16	duty (4)	enter (7)
64:18,19	Defendants (5) 2:7;6:19;7:3;11:1,	discussion (2)	31:25;33:2;34:14; 47:17	12:4;51:25;56:11; 61:21,25;73:12,18
days (23) 23:23;52:2,12,13,	2.7,0.19,7.3,11.1,	41:15;48:11	47.17	entered (9)
18,19;53:1;69:2,6,9,	Defendant's (2)	dismiss (7)	E	11:7;18:18;19:10,
10,16,18;70:2,16,18;	36:14,17	32:11,12;40:5,9;	- L	11;20:1;21:20;
71:3,5,7,15,22;72:4,	defense (3)	41:19,21;45:16	earlier (2)	22:18;52:24;55:3
15	12:24;13:8;21:15	dispositive (2)	31:7;53:21	entirely (1)
deadline (1)	defenses (5)	44:22:46:9	earliest (2)	46:17
69:19	13:6;21:15;22:14,	dispute (3)	69:22;71:12	entity (1)
deal (3)	16;61:10	17:23;18:11,19	early (2)	66:13
22:2;38:8;62:13	defined (2)	disregard (17)	11:13;22:7	entry (9)
dealing (1)	34:24;38:20	29:20;30:8,10,17,	ECF (1)	12:5,13;13:15,18;
10:17	DEL (1)	17;35:20,23;36:21;	24:2	19:12,20;22:5,20,24
deals (1)	7:11	37:12;38:24;39:18;	EDWARD (1)	equivalent (3)
53:11	delay (1)	42:9;43:8;44:15;	7:8	32:10,12;45:15
dealt (1)	61:9	45:12;48:23;50:8	effect (4)	error (3)
33:25	delivery (1)	distress (5)	27:10;56:12;60:6;	27:20,24;31:20
DEANNA (3)	28:2	36:9,17,19;37:4;	64:18	eScribers (1)
7:20;8:16;26:15	demonstrate (2) 44:11;58:20	48:3	effective (1)	4:21
debt (1) 66:4	demonstrated (1)	District (4) 14:16;51:16;	64:17 effectuation (1)	ESQ (6) 6:7,15,24;7:8,16,
debtor (1)	26:20	52:10;54:9	23:21	24
26:6	demurrer (1)	Doc# (4)	effort (3)	essentially (1)
debtors (9)	51:3	3:2,8,14;4:4	26:9;58:23;70:20	51:15
26:7,21;40:18;	denial (1)	docket (12)	efforts (1)	establish (2)
46:2;58:20,21;60:3;	22:19	23:7,22;24:1,9,12;	12:8	42:8;52:6
62:21:69:5	denials (1)	59:7,8,18;63:16,19;	Eightieth (3)	establishment (1)
debtors' (3)	61:17	64:7;66:19	3:14;58:16,17	61:13
13:7;26:8;58:22	denied (3)	docketed (5)	either (8)	et (5)
December (3)	22:6,21,24	25:25;26:1,2;36:1;	15:24;32:16,21;	2:6;4:3;8:20,21;
12:10,13;25:22	deposition (1)	70:12	35:14;37:10;39:18;	38:10
decide (3)	60:20	document (1)	57:1;60:9	ETS (32)
19:15;22:8;43:19	deputy (1)	64:13	Electronic (1)	28:22;29:3;31:23;
decided (1)	60:20	documents (5)	64:15	32:1,3,4,23;33:2;
22:17	describing (1)	62:24;64:25;65:2,	ELLIS (4)	34:13,13;35:24;
deciding (3)	61:21	6,23	6:2,10;10:5;16:7	36:2;39:3,3,17;
22:13;48:19;50:12	determined (2)	done (15)	eloquently (1)	41:14,25;42:8;
decision (7)	26:10;58:25	18:13,25;29:2;	31:15	44:13;47:7,14,14;
12:20;19:8;22:10;	detri (1)	31:10;36:15,18,20,	else (6)	49:3,5,12,16;50:3,6,
30:19;46:19;52:8,11	71:18 detrimental (1)	25;42:21;46:4; 47:10;67:6;68:15,	9:18;10:11;12:23; 20:14,23;72:19	14,20;51:2;52:7 ETS's (1)
decisions (1) 29:18	71:18	17;74:2	20:14,23;72:19 emotional (5)	50:2
declaration (2)	different (3)	door (2)	36:9,17,19;37:4;	evaluating (1)
26:14;59:20	23:6;30:18;64:23	8:6,10	48:2	41:4
declarations (1)	difficult (3)	doubts (1)	employee (5)	even (1)
			PJ (v)	

Case No. 12-12020-mg				February 11, 2015
45:23		11:16;48:20;	64:18	51:4;61:16
event (1)	\mathbf{F}	52:18,19;54:4,15,17,	foreclose (4)	,
57:10	.	24;55:9,10;56:6,8;	65:6,24;69:17;	G
evidence (20)	face (5)	57:4,15,25;62:16;	71:15	
15:12;26:7;27:10;	38:2;40:7;41:13;	73:24	foreclosed (1)	garbage (1)
29:17;30:6;42:7,16,	45:22;72:11	Filed (42)	71:15	73:4
19;43:7,10,10,15;	faced (1)	3:11;11:5,6,13,19;	foreclosure (16)	generally (1)
44:4,9;45:11;61:18;	45:15	12:4,12,13,15,16;	28:24;34:2;35:2;	22:7
63:7;67:3,9;68:13	facilitate (1)	13:17;14:20;20:2;	49:8;62:21;66:14;	gets (1)
evident (1)	21:23	24:12,20;25:23,25;	67:12,13;68:7,8,10;	42:21
28:22	fact (10)	26:1;31:20;36:2;	69:2,6,9;70:1;72:2	given (4)
evidentiary (7)	12:9;13:21,22;	41:11;42:1,1;51:2,	foregoing (1)	42:3;55:4,16;57:4
27:11;32:6;40:12;	16:1;31:19;34:7,14;	21;52:12,14,14;	64:16	giving (3)
49:2;61:14,15;67:25 exactly (4)	38:14;46:9;72:12	56:17;57:7,9,12; 59:6,7,8,17;62:3,8,	forgetfulness (1) 29:16	32:1,2;45:2
13:16;34:6,22;	factors (2)	16;63:3;73:3,16	form (4)	GLENN (1) 2:24
55:15	12:21;16:1	files (1)	31:1;62:5;69:21;	GMAC (12)
examined (2)	facts (17)	42:2	71:11	11:13;49:15,19;
26:8;58:22	29:13;30:22;32:9,	filing (6)	formed (1)	62:22,25;63:21;64:8,
example (1)	14;37:10;40:3,8;	18:22;19:19;27:6;	61:6	12;66:21;68:6,7;
63:8	46:3;48:17;49:8;	42:5;56:21;61:3	Fort (6)	69:19
exception (1)	50:5,8,19,23;51:4;	filings (1)	14:10,23;15:10,	GMACM (5)
38:19	52:6;63:11 factual (7)	60:25	13;16:13,19	68:25;69:1,2,25;
excluded (1)	36:24;41:9;44:8;	finally (1)	forth (7)	71:4
41:13	45:24;47:6;61:13,17	14:2	26:19;28:4;36:15;	GMAC's (1)
exclusively (1)	failed (1)	Financial (10)	51:14,15;55:11;62:2	72:3
34:24	44:6	3:18;4:5;6:3,11;	forum (1)	goes (6)
excusable (1)	fails (1)	10:5;16:7;23:15;	18:23	15:15;28:1;46:5;
13:5	60:1	68:5;69:20;71:10	Forward (19)	47:19,20;72:9
excuse (2)	failure (1)	find (3)	3:5,10;22:20;	Good (37)
14:21;49:7	12:22	32:9;47:18;51:4	24:10,13;25:14;	8:24;9:19,25;10:4,
excused (1)	fairly (2)	findings (1)	42:15,16;44:17,18,	24;12:23;16:6;
23:1	55:7;71:19	41:9	20;46:23;47:19,20;	21:12;22:15;27:21;
execute (1)	faith (26)	fine (3)	55:2;59:9;60:21,22;	28:14;33:10;34:5;
65:23	22:15;27:21;	10:22;72:18,18	67:3	35:6;37:1,24;38:15,
executed (3) 23:18;31:7;64:4	28:14;33:10;34:5;	firm (2) 10:25;61:23	foul (1) 43:5	19;39:17;42:8;43:8;
25:18;51:7;04:4 executes (1)	35:7;37:1,24;38:15,	first (12)	found (2)	44:10,14;45:11,25; 48:12,24;50:2,6,7,9,
34:4	20;39:17;42:8;43:8;	14:7,7;16:8;17:1;	21:22;33:19	14,16,19;52:7,23;
executing (3)	44:10,14;45:11,25;	24:9;25:15;30:25;	fourth (1)	73:14
64:25;65:2,5	48:12,24;50:2,6,7,9,	48:9;53:11;54:13;	36:8	good-faith (2)
executive (1)	14,19;52:7	60:14:63:12	Franck (1)	27:20,24
26:21	false (1) 62:22	first-class (1)	66:18	goods (3)
Exhibit (8)	familiar (1)	11:24	F-R-A-N-C-K (1)	11:9,11,12
26:16,17;36:2;	63:4	Floor (1)	66:18	Gotshal (2)
63:15,16,19;69:4;	far (3)	7:5	frankly (1)	9:21;21:13
70:12	18:9;22:6;37:5	Flushing (1)	21:24	governing (1)
exist (3)	Fargo (2)	7:14	fraud (1)	34:25
13:25;18:9;34:25	33:6;51:16	focus (1)	33:4	governs (1)
existing (2)	February (5)	65:14	fraudulently (1)	14:18
61:11,12	2:20;12:15,17;	focusing (1)	68:15	grab (1)
expanded (1)	26:2;56:6	37:7	Friday (1)	8:10
52:8	Federal (3)	Foerster (3)	56:8	grant (2)
expands (1)	14:17;19:17;61:1	24:8;53:8;58:14	frivolous (2)	12:21;59:25
58:2	feelings (1)	follow (1)	62:9,13	granted (1)
expunge (2)	29:21	36:10 followed (1)	front (1) 66:25	13:2 Croon (1)
26:4;58:18 expunged (1)	fiduciary (4)	13:17	fulfilling (1)	Green (1) 2:17
55:12	34:14,19,21;35:2	follows (1)	51:7	Greystone (1)
extension (2)	fifteen (1)	36:12	full (1)	14:15
55:9;61:12	23:23	footer (1)	64:18	grounds (3)
55.7,01.12	Fifth (1)	72:16	further (5)	38:23;43:15,18
	3:4 file (17)	force (1)	13:12;20:15;21:9;	guess (3)
	inc (17)	(/	,,,	6 /

Case No. 12-12020-mg	. 9			February 11, 20
55:1;60:8;69:13	20:4,6,15,24;21:10,	improperly (2)	36:9,15;37:3;	25;22:6,18,21,24;
	12,14,21;23:5,11,16;	34:3;72:3	47:25	45:22;66:4
H	24:4,7,14;25:5,7,19,	inadvertence (1)	interest (2)	July (14)
	22;26:3;27:8,13,25;	29:16	34:1;65:3	11:8;64:18;68:6,8;
hac (1)	28:12,17,21;29:5,9;	Inc (9)	interpreted (1)	69:1,7,10;70:4,6,7,8
9:17	30:1,25;31:4,13;	4:5;6:3;10:6;	69:17	
				10;71:1;72:3
happen (2)	33:24;34:7,18;35:25,	64:15;66:11,12,15,	into (8)	jump (1)
12:10;51:25	25;37:15;38:1,17,19;	18;67:14	11:7,12;18:18;	32:14
happened (4)	39:1,12,20;41:20;	include (2)	29:13;36:5,12;	June (1)
47:8;49:3,11,17	45:19,21;46:16,16;	36:22;57:25	37:19;52:8	12:1
happens (2)	47:1,24;48:5,9;	including (3)	invalid (1)	JUSTIN (3)
23:25;24:1	50:21;52:23;53:7,13,	64:23;65:8;66:1	43:16	6:15;10:4;16:6
harass (1)	16,19,23;54:7,10;	incorporated (1)	investigation (1)	
61:8	55:1,16,21,24;56:22,	36:5	61:16	K
harm (1)	25;57:21;58:4,7,10,	incorporates (1)	invoices (3)	
43:4	13,17;59:15,24;60:5,	19:17	14:3,4,4	Kachlon (18)
hatred (1)	7,8,13;63:10,13,16;	incorporation (1)	involvement (1)	29:7,22,24;30:12,
38:22	65:16,19;66:17;67:2,	64:20	55:4	
				19;32:24;33:6,13,15
hear (6)	7,10,16;68:4,11,16,	increase (2)	issue (32)	25;34:22,22;38:17;
16:3;20:12;25:9,	18,23;70:4,19;71:23;	36:20;61:9	19:9;20:10,17;	39:12;51:5,14;52:8,
10,14;47:21	72:17,21;73:1,5,14,	incur (1)	21:2,5;22:2;23:8;	Kansas (3)
heard (2)	22;74:2	27:19	26:10;29:18;30:15;	6:22;9:16;10:25
20:23;23:6	Honor's (3)	indicate (1)	37:4;38:8,12,14;	KATHY (2)
Hearing (22)	22:1;30:13;36:10	16:2	41:7;43:18,19;44:9;	7:24;59:20
3:2,5,8,10,14;	hope (1)	indicating (1)	45:7;47:2;49:1,25;	key (2)
27:11;32:7,10;	45:5	15:1	56:16;57:4;58:24;	33:1;36:23
40:13;46:10;49:2;	HORST (3)	indication (1)	62:18;68:24;69:14,	kind (1)
52:16,21;53:2,11;	7:20;26:15,17	71:25	23;72:7,12;73:2	50:24
54:3;57:16;58:6;	HUD (1)	infliction (3)	issued (2)	KIRKLAND (4)
60:19,21,22;62:14	66:6	36:9;37:4;48:2	14:4;62:23	6:2,10;10:5;16:7
hearsay (1)	humiliation (2)	informal (3)	issues (7)	knock (2)
15:12	36:16,25	45:25;57:8,12	22:9,13;24:21;	8:6,9
heightened (1)	hundred (1)	information (3)	43:1;46:19;57:17;	knowledge (4)
39:3	44:24	27:20;61:6,19	62:19	27:8;28:21;36:19;
held (1)	HUSCH (3)	inherent (1)	item (4)	61:5
41:2	6:18;9:15;10:25	29:18	53:9;58:15,15;	knows (1)
Hello (1)				
neno (i)	3.13,3.12,13.25	initial (3)	/0.4	15.8
		initial (3) 14·20·41·20·49·21	70:4	15:8 Kurtzman (1)
10:10	I	14:20;41:20;49:21		Kurtzman (1)
10:10 herein (2)	I	14:20;41:20;49:21 initially (1)	J	
10:10 herein (2) 28:3;36:15	I identified (2)	14:20;41:20;49:21 initially (1) 49:19	J	Kurtzman (1) 7:22
10:10 herein (2) 28:3;36:15 Here's (1)	I identified (2) 61:15,18	14:20;41:20;49:21 initially (1) 49:19 initiated (3)	J January (3)	Kurtzman (1)
10:10 herein (2) 28:3;36:15 Here's (1) 51:24	identified (2) 61:15,18 identifies (2)	14:20;41:20;49:21 initially (1) 49:19 initiated (3) 67:11,14;69:25	January (3) 12:14;25:25;59:2	Kurtzman (1) 7:22 L
10:10 herein (2) 28:3;36:15 Here's (1) 51:24	I identified (2) 61:15,18	14:20;41:20;49:21 initially (1) 49:19 initiated (3)	J January (3)	Kurtzman (1) 7:22
10:10 herein (2) 28:3;36:15 Here's (1) 51:24	identified (2) 61:15,18 identifies (2)	14:20;41:20;49:21 initially (1) 49:19 initiated (3) 67:11,14;69:25	January (3) 12:14;25:25;59:2	Kurtzman (1) 7:22 L
10:10 herein (2) 28:3;36:15 Here's (1) 51:24 Hewlett (1) 23:10	identified (2) 61:15,18 identifies (2) 63:20;64:23 identify (1)	14:20;41:20;49:21 initially (1) 49:19 initiated (3) 67:11,14;69:25 Initiative (2)	January (3) 12:14;25:25;59:2 Jeff (3) 9:25;20:24;23:5	Kurtzman (1) 7:22 L labels (1) 40:3
10:10 herein (2) 28:3;36:15 Here's (1) 51:24 Hewlett (1) 23:10 Hewlett-Packard (2)	identified (2) 61:15,18 identifies (2) 63:20;64:23 identify (1) 60:2	14:20;41:20;49:21 initially (1) 49:19 initiated (3) 67:11,14;69:25 Initiative (2) 61:20,21	January (3) 12:14;25:25;59:2 Jeff (3) 9:25;20:24;23:5 Jeffery (4)	Kurtzman (1) 7:22 L labels (1) 40:3 lack (5)
10:10 herein (2) 28:3;36:15 Here's (1) 51:24 Hewlett (1) 23:10 Hewlett-Packard (2) 3:18;23:15	I identified (2) 61:15,18 identifies (2) 63:20;64:23 identify (1) 60:2 identifying (1)	14:20;41:20;49:21 initially (1) 49:19 initiated (3) 67:11,14;69:25 Initiative (2) 61:20,21 injunction (1) 19:6	January (3) 12:14;25:25;59:2 Jeff (3) 9:25;20:24;23:5 Jeffery (4) 62:25;63:17,18;	Kurtzman (1) 7:22 L labels (1) 40:3 lack (5) 38:14;39:16;
10:10 herein (2) 28:3;36:15 Here's (1) 51:24 Hewlett (1) 23:10 Hewlett-Packard (2) 3:18;23:15 highlight (2)	I identified (2) 61:15,18 identifies (2) 63:20;64:23 identify (1) 60:2 identifying (1) 17:9	14:20;41:20;49:21 initially (1) 49:19 initiated (3) 67:11,14;69:25 Initiative (2) 61:20,21 injunction (1) 19:6 inquire (1)	January (3) 12:14;25:25;59:2 Jeff (3) 9:25;20:24;23:5 Jeffery (4) 62:25;63:17,18; 66:21	Kurtzman (1) 7:22 L labels (1) 40:3 lack (5) 38:14;39:16; 45:24;48:12;61:19
10:10 herein (2) 28:3;36:15 Here's (1) 51:24 Hewlett (1) 23:10 Hewlett-Packard (2) 3:18;23:15 highlight (2) 26:24;48:10	identified (2) 61:15,18 identifies (2) 63:20;64:23 identify (1) 60:2 identifying (1) 17:9 ignore (2)	14:20;41:20;49:21 initially (1) 49:19 initiated (3) 67:11,14;69:25 Initiative (2) 61:20,21 injunction (1) 19:6 inquire (1) 62:20	January (3) 12:14;25:25;59:2 Jeff (3) 9:25;20:24;23:5 Jeffery (4) 62:25;63:17,18; 66:21 Jeffrey (1)	Kurtzman (1) 7:22 L labels (1) 40:3 lack (5) 38:14;39:16; 45:24;48:12;61:19 lacked (1)
10:10 herein (2) 28:3;36:15 Here's (1) 51:24 Hewlett (1) 23:10 Hewlett-Packard (2) 3:18;23:15 highlight (2) 26:24;48:10 Hold (2)	I identified (2) 61:15,18 identifies (2) 63:20;64:23 identify (1) 60:2 identifying (1) 17:9 ignore (2) 19:22,24	14:20;41:20;49:21 initially (1) 49:19 initiated (3) 67:11,14;69:25 Initiative (2) 61:20,21 injunction (1) 19:6 inquire (1) 62:20 inquiry (3)	January (3) 12:14;25:25;59:2 Jeff (3) 9:25;20:24;23:5 Jeffery (4) 62:25;63:17,18; 66:21 Jeffrey (1) 63:13	Kurtzman (1) 7:22 L labels (1) 40:3 lack (5) 38:14;39:16; 45:24;48:12;61:19 lacked (1) 38:23
10:10 herein (2) 28:3;36:15 Here's (1) 51:24 Hewlett (1) 23:10 Hewlett-Packard (2) 3:18;23:15 highlight (2) 26:24;48:10 Hold (2) 8:20;69:6	I identified (2) 61:15,18 identifies (2) 63:20;64:23 identify (1) 60:2 identifying (1) 17:9 ignore (2) 19:22,24 III (1)	14:20;41:20;49:21 initially (1) 49:19 initiated (3) 67:11,14;69:25 Initiative (2) 61:20,21 injunction (1) 19:6 inquire (1) 62:20 inquiry (3) 29:13;47:18;61:6	January (3) 12:14;25:25;59:2 Jeff (3) 9:25;20:24;23:5 Jeffery (4) 62:25;63:17,18; 66:21 Jeffrey (1) 63:13 JOHN (3)	Kurtzman (1) 7:22 L labels (1) 40:3 lack (5) 38:14;39:16; 45:24;48:12;61:19 lacked (1) 38:23 landline (2)
10:10 herein (2) 28:3;36:15 Here's (1) 51:24 Hewlett (1) 23:10 Hewlett-Packard (2) 3:18;23:15 highlight (2) 26:24;48:10 Hold (2) 8:20;69:6 Homecomings (1)	I identified (2) 61:15,18 identifies (2) 63:20;64:23 identify (1) 60:2 identifying (1) 17:9 ignore (2) 19:22,24 III (1) 24:10	14:20;41:20;49:21 initially (1) 49:19 initiated (3) 67:11,14;69:25 Initiative (2) 61:20,21 injunction (1) 19:6 inquire (1) 62:20 inquiry (3) 29:13;47:18;61:6 instruction (2)	January (3) 12:14;25:25;59:2 Jeff (3) 9:25;20:24;23:5 Jeffery (4) 62:25;63:17,18; 66:21 Jeffrey (1) 63:13 JOHN (3) 7:16;10:13;53:16	Kurtzman (1) 7:22 L labels (1) 40:3 lack (5) 38:14;39:16; 45:24;48:12;61:19 lacked (1) 38:23 landline (2) 25:18,20
10:10 herein (2) 28:3;36:15 Here's (1) 51:24 Hewlett (1) 23:10 Hewlett-Packard (2) 3:18;23:15 highlight (2) 26:24;48:10 Hold (2) 8:20;69:6 Homecomings (1) 68:5	I identified (2) 61:15,18 identifies (2) 63:20;64:23 identify (1) 60:2 identifying (1) 17:9 ignore (2) 19:22,24 III (1) 24:10 IL (1)	14:20;41:20;49:21 initially (1) 49:19 initiated (3) 67:11,14;69:25 Initiative (2) 61:20,21 injunction (1) 19:6 inquire (1) 62:20 inquiry (3) 29:13;47:18;61:6 instruction (2) 31:24;39:4	January (3) 12:14;25:25;59:2 Jeff (3) 9:25;20:24;23:5 Jeffery (4) 62:25;63:17,18; 66:21 Jeffrey (1) 63:13 JOHN (3) 7:16;10:13;53:16 Johnson (3)	Kurtzman (1) 7:22 L labels (1) 40:3 lack (5) 38:14;39:16; 45:24;48:12;61:19 lacked (1) 38:23 landline (2) 25:18,20 language (1)
10:10 herein (2) 28:3;36:15 Here's (1) 51:24 Hewlett (1) 23:10 Hewlett-Packard (2) 3:18;23:15 highlight (2) 26:24;48:10 Hold (2) 8:20;69:6 Homecomings (1) 68:5 HON (1)	I identified (2) 61:15,18 identifies (2) 63:20;64:23 identify (1) 60:2 identifying (1) 17:9 ignore (2) 19:22,24 III (1) 24:10 IL (1) 6:13	14:20;41:20;49:21 initially (1) 49:19 initiated (3) 67:11,14;69:25 Initiative (2) 61:20,21 injunction (1) 19:6 inquire (1) 62:20 inquiry (3) 29:13;47:18;61:6 instruction (2) 31:24;39:4 instructions (2)	January (3) 12:14;25:25;59:2 Jeff (3) 9:25;20:24;23:5 Jeffery (4) 62:25;63:17,18; 66:21 Jeffrey (1) 63:13 JOHN (3) 7:16;10:13;53:16 Johnson (3) 59:10,14;73:21	Kurtzman (1) 7:22 L labels (1) 40:3 lack (5) 38:14;39:16; 45:24;48:12;61:19 lacked (1) 38:23 landline (2) 25:18,20 language (1) 14:17
10:10 herein (2) 28:3;36:15 Here's (1) 51:24 Hewlett (1) 23:10 Hewlett-Packard (2) 3:18;23:15 highlight (2) 26:24;48:10 Hold (2) 8:20;69:6 Homecomings (1) 68:5 HON (1) 2:24	I identified (2) 61:15,18 identifies (2) 63:20;64:23 identify (1) 60:2 identifying (1) 17:9 ignore (2) 19:22,24 III (1) 24:10 IL (1) 6:13 ill (3)	14:20;41:20;49:21 initially (1) 49:19 initiated (3) 67:11,14;69:25 Initiative (2) 61:20,21 injunction (1) 19:6 inquire (1) 62:20 inquiry (3) 29:13;47:18;61:6 instruction (2) 31:24;39:4 instructions (2) 28:23;32:4	January (3) 12:14;25:25;59:2 Jeff (3) 9:25;20:24;23:5 Jeffery (4) 62:25;63:17,18; 66:21 Jeffrey (1) 63:13 JOHN (3) 7:16;10:13;53:16 Johnson (3) 59:10,14;73:21 Jordan (5)	Kurtzman (1) 7:22 L labels (1) 40:3 lack (5) 38:14;39:16; 45:24;48:12;61:19 lacked (1) 38:23 landline (2) 25:18,20 language (1)
10:10 herein (2) 28:3;36:15 Here's (1) 51:24 Hewlett (1) 23:10 Hewlett-Packard (2) 3:18;23:15 highlight (2) 26:24;48:10 Hold (2) 8:20;69:6 Homecomings (1) 68:5 HON (1) 2:24	I identified (2) 61:15,18 identifies (2) 63:20;64:23 identify (1) 60:2 identifying (1) 17:9 ignore (2) 19:22,24 III (1) 24:10 IL (1) 6:13	14:20;41:20;49:21 initially (1) 49:19 initiated (3) 67:11,14;69:25 Initiative (2) 61:20,21 injunction (1) 19:6 inquire (1) 62:20 inquiry (3) 29:13;47:18;61:6 instruction (2) 31:24;39:4 instructions (2)	January (3) 12:14;25:25;59:2 Jeff (3) 9:25;20:24;23:5 Jeffery (4) 62:25;63:17,18; 66:21 Jeffrey (1) 63:13 JOHN (3) 7:16;10:13;53:16 Johnson (3) 59:10,14;73:21	Kurtzman (1) 7:22 L labels (1) 40:3 lack (5) 38:14;39:16; 45:24;48:12;61:19 lacked (1) 38:23 landline (2) 25:18,20 language (1) 14:17
10:10 herein (2) 28:3;36:15 Here's (1) 51:24 Hewlett (1) 23:10 Hewlett-Packard (2) 3:18;23:15 highlight (2) 26:24;48:10 Hold (2) 8:20;69:6 Homecomings (1) 68:5 HON (1) 2:24 Honor (147)	identified (2) 61:15,18 identifies (2) 63:20;64:23 identify (1) 60:2 identifying (1) 17:9 ignore (2) 19:22,24 III (1) 24:10 IL (1) 6:13 ill (3) 30:7;38:22;39:18	14:20;41:20;49:21 initially (1) 49:19 initiated (3) 67:11,14;69:25 Initiative (2) 61:20,21 injunction (1) 19:6 inquire (1) 62:20 inquiry (3) 29:13;47:18;61:6 instruction (2) 31:24;39:4 instructions (2) 28:23;32:4	January (3) 12:14;25:25;59:2 Jeff (3) 9:25;20:24;23:5 Jeffery (4) 62:25;63:17,18; 66:21 Jeffrey (1) 63:13 JOHN (3) 7:16;10:13;53:16 Johnson (3) 59:10,14;73:21 Jordan (5) 8:5,9;24:7;53:7;	Kurtzman (1) 7:22 L labels (1) 40:3 lack (5) 38:14;39:16; 45:24;48:12;61:19 lacked (1) 38:23 landline (2) 25:18,20 language (1) 14:17 LaSalle (1) 6:12
10:10 herein (2) 28:3;36:15 Here's (1) 51:24 Hewlett (1) 23:10 Hewlett-Packard (2) 3:18;23:15 highlight (2) 26:24;48:10 Hold (2) 8:20;69:6 Homecomings (1) 68:5 HON (1) 2:24 Honor (147) 8:5,13,24;9:6,9,11,	I identified (2) 61:15,18 identifies (2) 63:20;64:23 identify (1) 60:2 identifying (1) 17:9 ignore (2) 19:22,24 III (1) 24:10 IL (1) 6:13 ill (3) 30:7;38:22;39:18 implementing (1)	14:20;41:20;49:21 initially (1) 49:19 initiated (3) 67:11,14;69:25 Initiative (2) 61:20,21 injunction (1) 19:6 inquire (1) 62:20 inquiry (3) 29:13;47:18;61:6 instruction (2) 31:24;39:4 instructions (2) 28:23;32:4 insufficiently (1) 30:22	January (3) 12:14;25:25;59:2 Jeff (3) 9:25;20:24;23:5 Jeffery (4) 62:25;63:17,18; 66:21 Jeffrey (1) 63:13 JOHN (3) 7:16;10:13;53:16 Johnson (3) 59:10,14;73:21 Jordan (5) 8:5,9;24:7;53:7; 58:13	Kurtzman (1) 7:22 L labels (1) 40:3 lack (5) 38:14;39:16; 45:24;48:12;61:19 lacked (1) 38:23 landline (2) 25:18,20 language (1) 14:17 LaSalle (1) 6:12 last (4)
10:10 herein (2) 28:3;36:15 Here's (1) 51:24 Hewlett (1) 23:10 Hewlett-Packard (2) 3:18;23:15 highlight (2) 26:24;48:10 Hold (2) 8:20;69:6 Homecomings (1) 68:5 HON (1) 2:24 Honor (147) 8:5,13,24;9:6,9,11, 13,17,19,20,25;10:4,	identified (2) 61:15,18 identifies (2) 63:20;64:23 identify (1) 60:2 identifying (1) 17:9 ignore (2) 19:22,24 III (1) 24:10 IL (1) 6:13 ill (3) 30:7;38:22;39:18 implementing (1) 32:5	14:20;41:20;49:21 initially (1) 49:19 initiated (3) 67:11,14;69:25 Initiative (2) 61:20,21 injunction (1) 19:6 inquire (1) 62:20 inquiry (3) 29:13;47:18;61:6 instruction (2) 31:24;39:4 instructions (2) 28:23;32:4 insufficiently (1) 30:22 intended (1)	January (3) 12:14;25:25;59:2 Jeff (3) 9:25;20:24;23:5 Jeffery (4) 62:25;63:17,18; 66:21 Jeffrey (1) 63:13 JOHN (3) 7:16;10:13;53:16 Johnson (3) 59:10,14;73:21 Jordan (5) 8:5,9;24:7;53:7; 58:13 JOSEPH (1)	L labels (1) 40:3 lack (5) 38:14;39:16; 45:24;48:12;61:19 lacked (1) 38:23 landline (2) 25:18,20 language (1) 14:17 LaSalle (1) 6:12 last (4) 53:18;58:5,15;
10:10 herein (2) 28:3;36:15 Here's (1) 51:24 Hewlett (1) 23:10 Hewlett-Packard (2) 3:18;23:15 highlight (2) 26:24;48:10 Hold (2) 8:20;69:6 Homecomings (1) 68:5 HON (1) 2:24 Honor (147) 8:5,13,24;9:6,9,11, 13,17,19,20,25;10:4, 13,19,24;11:7,19;	identified (2) 61:15,18 identifies (2) 63:20;64:23 identify (1) 60:2 identifying (1) 17:9 ignore (2) 19:22,24 III (1) 24:10 IL (1) 6:13 ill (3) 30:7;38:22;39:18 implementing (1) 32:5 important (1)	14:20;41:20;49:21 initially (1) 49:19 initiated (3) 67:11,14;69:25 Initiative (2) 61:20,21 injunction (1) 19:6 inquire (1) 62:20 inquiry (3) 29:13;47:18;61:6 instruction (2) 31:24;39:4 instructions (2) 28:23;32:4 insufficiently (1) 30:22 intended (1) 72:16	January (3) 12:14;25:25;59:2 Jeff (3) 9:25;20:24;23:5 Jeffery (4) 62:25;63:17,18; 66:21 Jeffrey (1) 63:13 JOHN (3) 7:16;10:13;53:16 Johnson (3) 59:10,14;73:21 Jordan (5) 8:5,9;24:7;53:7; 58:13 JOSEPH (1) 7:22	L labels (1) 40:3 lack (5) 38:14;39:16; 45:24;48:12;61:19 lacked (1) 38:23 landline (2) 25:18,20 language (1) 14:17 LaSalle (1) 6:12 last (4) 53:18;58:5,15; 68:5
10:10 herein (2) 28:3;36:15 Here's (1) 51:24 Hewlett (1) 23:10 Hewlett-Packard (2) 3:18;23:15 highlight (2) 26:24;48:10 Hold (2) 8:20;69:6 Homecomings (1) 68:5 HON (1) 2:24 Honor (147) 8:5,13,24;9:6,9,11, 13,17,19,20,25;10:4, 13,19,24;11:7,19; 12:18;13:3,10;	identified (2) 61:15,18 identifies (2) 63:20;64:23 identify (1) 60:2 identifying (1) 17:9 ignore (2) 19:22,24 III (1) 24:10 IL (1) 6:13 ill (3) 30:7;38:22;39:18 implementing (1) 32:5 important (1) 17:22	14:20;41:20;49:21 initially (1) 49:19 initiated (3) 67:11,14;69:25 Initiative (2) 61:20,21 injunction (1) 19:6 inquire (1) 62:20 inquiry (3) 29:13;47:18;61:6 instruction (2) 31:24;39:4 instructions (2) 28:23;32:4 insufficiently (1) 30:22 intended (1) 72:16 intent (1)	January (3) 12:14;25:25;59:2 Jeff (3) 9:25;20:24;23:5 Jeffery (4) 62:25;63:17,18; 66:21 Jeffrey (1) 63:13 JOHN (3) 7:16;10:13;53:16 Johnson (3) 59:10,14;73:21 Jordan (5) 8:5,9;24:7;53:7; 58:13 JOSEPH (1) 7:22 JUDGE (1)	L labels (1) 40:3 lack (5) 38:14;39:16; 45:24;48:12;61:19 lacked (1) 38:23 landline (2) 25:18,20 language (1) 14:17 LaSalle (1) 6:12 last (4) 53:18;58:5,15; 68:5 last-ditch (1)
10:10 herein (2) 28:3;36:15 Here's (1) 51:24 Hewlett (1) 23:10 Hewlett-Packard (2) 3:18;23:15 highlight (2) 26:24;48:10 Hold (2) 8:20;69:6 Homecomings (1) 68:5 HON (1) 2:24 Honor (147) 8:5,13,24;9:6,9,11, 13,17,19,20,25;10:4, 13,19,24;11:7,19; 12:18;13:3,10; 14:14;15:19,22;16:5,	identified (2) 61:15,18 identifies (2) 63:20;64:23 identify (1) 60:2 identifying (1) 17:9 ignore (2) 19:22,24 III (1) 24:10 IL (1) 6:13 ill (3) 30:7;38:22;39:18 implementing (1) 32:5 important (1) 17:22 impose (1)	14:20;41:20;49:21 initially (1) 49:19 initiated (3) 67:11,14;69:25 Initiative (2) 61:20,21 injunction (1) 19:6 inquire (1) 62:20 inquiry (3) 29:13;47:18;61:6 instruction (2) 31:24;39:4 instructions (2) 28:23;32:4 insufficiently (1) 30:22 intended (1) 72:16 intent (1) 28:21	January (3) 12:14;25:25;59:2 Jeff (3) 9:25;20:24;23:5 Jeffery (4) 62:25;63:17,18; 66:21 Jeffrey (1) 63:13 JOHN (3) 7:16;10:13;53:16 Johnson (3) 59:10,14;73:21 Jordan (5) 8:5,9;24:7;53:7; 58:13 JOSEPH (1) 7:22 JUDGE (1) 2:25	L labels (1) 40:3 lack (5) 38:14;39:16; 45:24;48:12;61:19 lacked (1) 38:23 landline (2) 25:18,20 language (1) 14:17 LaSalle (1) 6:12 last (4) 53:18;58:5,15; 68:5 last-ditch (1) 70:20
10:10 herein (2) 28:3;36:15 Here's (1) 51:24 Hewlett (1) 23:10 Hewlett-Packard (2) 3:18;23:15 highlight (2) 26:24;48:10 Hold (2) 8:20;69:6 Homecomings (1) 68:5 HON (1) 2:24 Honor (147) 8:5,13,24;9:6,9,11, 13,17,19,20,25;10:4, 13,19,24;11:7,19; 12:18;13:3,10; 14:14;15:19,22;16:5, 6,8,17,24;17:2,7,12,	identified (2) 61:15,18 identifies (2) 63:20;64:23 identify (1) 60:2 identifying (1) 17:9 ignore (2) 19:22,24 III (1) 24:10 IL (1) 6:13 ill (3) 30:7;38:22;39:18 implementing (1) 32:5 important (1) 17:22 impose (1) 31:25	14:20;41:20;49:21 initially (1) 49:19 initiated (3) 67:11,14;69:25 Initiative (2) 61:20,21 injunction (1) 19:6 inquire (1) 62:20 inquiry (3) 29:13;47:18;61:6 instruction (2) 31:24;39:4 instructions (2) 28:23;32:4 insufficiently (1) 30:22 intended (1) 72:16 intent (1) 28:21 intention (1)	January (3) 12:14;25:25;59:2 Jeff (3) 9:25;20:24;23:5 Jeffery (4) 62:25;63:17,18; 66:21 Jeffrey (1) 63:13 JOHN (3) 7:16;10:13;53:16 Johnson (3) 59:10,14;73:21 Jordan (5) 8:5,9;24:7;53:7; 58:13 JOSEPH (1) 7:22 JUDGE (1) 2:25 Judgment (15)	L labels (1) 40:3 lack (5) 38:14;39:16; 45:24;48:12;61:19 lacked (1) 38:23 landline (2) 25:18,20 language (1) 14:17 LaSalle (1) 6:12 last (4) 53:18;58:5,15; 68:5 last-ditch (1) 70:20 late (3)
10:10 herein (2) 28:3;36:15 Here's (1) 51:24 Hewlett (1) 23:10 Hewlett-Packard (2) 3:18;23:15 highlight (2) 26:24;48:10 Hold (2) 8:20;69:6 Homecomings (1) 68:5 HON (1) 2:24 Honor (147) 8:5,13,24;9:6,9,11, 13,17,19,20,25;10:4, 13,19,24;11:7,19; 12:18;13:3,10; 14:14;15:19,22;16:5,	identified (2) 61:15,18 identifies (2) 63:20;64:23 identify (1) 60:2 identifying (1) 17:9 ignore (2) 19:22,24 III (1) 24:10 IL (1) 6:13 ill (3) 30:7;38:22;39:18 implementing (1) 32:5 important (1) 17:22 impose (1)	14:20;41:20;49:21 initially (1) 49:19 initiated (3) 67:11,14;69:25 Initiative (2) 61:20,21 injunction (1) 19:6 inquire (1) 62:20 inquiry (3) 29:13;47:18;61:6 instruction (2) 31:24;39:4 instructions (2) 28:23;32:4 insufficiently (1) 30:22 intended (1) 72:16 intent (1) 28:21	January (3) 12:14;25:25;59:2 Jeff (3) 9:25;20:24;23:5 Jeffery (4) 62:25;63:17,18; 66:21 Jeffrey (1) 63:13 JOHN (3) 7:16;10:13;53:16 Johnson (3) 59:10,14;73:21 Jordan (5) 8:5,9;24:7;53:7; 58:13 JOSEPH (1) 7:22 JUDGE (1) 2:25	L labels (1) 40:3 lack (5) 38:14;39:16; 45:24;48:12;61:19 lacked (1) 38:23 landline (2) 25:18,20 language (1) 14:17 LaSalle (1) 6:12 last (4) 53:18;58:5,15; 68:5 last-ditch (1) 70:20

Case No. 12-12020-mg	, , , ı y	03 01 32		February 11, 2015
28:1;61:3	31:1;34:13;50:23;	12:1;14:9	38:9;46:6;49:1;	moment (4)
Laura (1)	58:1;65:9;66:1	mailing (3)	55:16	46:11,12;66:17;
66:18	line (1)	15:2,3;28:2	mean (7)	67:16
law (18)	25:7	Main (2)	33:5,13;45:21;	money (1)
14:13;15:3;27:7;	LIQUIDATING (16)	6:20;7:13	49:4;69:16;70:19;	14:1
34:25;46:19;48:25;	2:3;3:8,17;4:2;	major (1)	72:16	more (5)
50:1;51:3,5;53:21,	7:21,25;9:7;10:2;	26:24	meaning (2)	20:12;31:15;
24;54:1;58:1;61:11,	20:25;23:6,14,19;	makes (3)	38:21;72:15	43:15,17;50:13
12,13,23;62:24	26:15;53:8,10;59:21	13:10;18:11;36:22	means (1)	morning (11)
lawsuit (5)	list (3)	making (7)	44:15	8:24;9:19,25;10:4,
14:15;16:10;	16:19;63:20;64:1	9:23;10:11;19:8;	meat (1)	24;16:6;21:12;
19:20;49:9;57:6	listening (1)	22:10;29:13;46:19;	48:21	24:10,13;46:16;
lawyer (4)	48:11	62:11	meet (1)	60:18
51:18,19,22,23	litigated (1)	malice (22)	32:24	Morrison (3)
lays (1) 39:12	50:4 litigation (6)	27:9,15;28:9,11, 16,19,20;29:17,19;	meeting (1) 58:9	24:8;53:8;58:14 MORROW (1)
lead (1)	18:20;21:24;	33:10;35:9,15,16;	member (5)	7:22
9:16	49:10,11;50:17;61:9	38:20,21;44:14;	54:9;63:21;65:3,8;	mortgage (8)
learned (2)	little (1)	48:12,17;50:3,8,14;	66:1	27:23;63:21;
20:8;49:4	65:11	52:7	memorandum (1)	64:15;65:1,4,7,24;
least (3)	live (1)	malicious (4)	58:1	68:6
27:15;40:17;51:6	25:7	28:21;36:15;	mental (1)	mortgagee (1)
leave (7)	LLC (3)	38:19;41:15	36:17	47:15
40:9,14;48:20;	4:21;7:2;63:21	maliciously (1)	mention (1)	Moss (60)
50:12;52:1,25;57:4	Lloyds (1)	48:22	13:13	3:6;7:23;24:14,23,
led (1)	8:21	Management (1)	Mere (2)	23;25:1,2,4,5,6,8,9,
49:3	LLP (3)	3:19	29:12,15	12,13,17,19;26:20;
legal (10)	6:2,10,18	MANN (9)	merely (1)	30:15;32:19,22;
12:3;15:4;16:19;	lo (1)	6:24;9:15;10:24,	69:20	33:3;34:11;35:23;
43:17,18,19;44:11,	54:14	25;11:19;15:19,22,	meritorious (7)	36:22;37:3;39:11,
11;60:2;61:10 lender (4)	loan (8) 30:11;65:1,4,5,7,	25;16:5 many (2)	12:24;13:6,8; 21:14,15;22:14,16	22;42:19;43:14; 44:6,20;45:1,5,13,
32:2;39:4,5;47:15	24;67:15;68:5	57:23;62:2	merits (3)	23;46:3;47:21;48:8,
Leslie (2)	Local (2)	March (5)	22:8,17;41:22	9,14,15,16;49:7,20;
59:8;73:6	13:15,16	55:24,24;56:1,8,10	MERS (20)	50:21;51:1,9,10,11,
less (2)	log (1)	Markowitz (2)	62:25;63:2,22,23;	13,18,19;52:1,3,6,16,
33:7;69:9	62:24	29:8;30:13	64:6,9,10,24;65:1,4,	20,21;53:3,4
letter (20)	London (1)	Martha (4)	5,7,18,25;66:3,7,22,	Moss' (5)
24:1;32:17;47:14;	8:21	3:11;7:12;10:14;	24,25;67:5	25:7;26:10;36:1;
68:25;69:5,7,10,18,	long (2)	53:12	metropolitan (1)	42:9,13
19,19;70:5,6,7,19,	29:18;50:18	MARTIN (1)	54:20	Most (2)
24;71:6,7,24;72:4,16	longer (1)	2:24	MICHAEL (2)	62:7;73:3
Lexington (1)	11:22	master (8)	7:8;9:13	Motion (23)
6:4	Look (8)	11:8,15,22;12:2;	might (3)	3:2;4:4;9:10,17;
Liability (8) 3:4,15;26:11,20;	33:15;39:14; 40:17;41:7;51:12,	13:9;14:23;16:17; 17:8	26:18;53:13;59:22 mind (1)	11:3;12:13,21; 13:14;18:11;19:12;
27:19,24;44:23;	24;67:22;73:10	Mateo (1)	35:12	22:5,19,20,23;32:10,
58:25	looked (2)	36:4	minimum (1)	12;40:5;41:19,20;
liable (4)	47:4;57:5	matter (14)	39:17	45:15;57:5;61:4;
11:21;13:21,22;	looking (7)	3:10;8:17;12:8,12;	minute (2)	62:17
62:21	29:22,23;38:16;	19:12;20:1;22:13;	23:6;56:15	motivated (1)
LIEBERT (15)	46:23;56:1;70:3;	23:2;24:9;34:7;53:6;	misconduct (1)	38:21
2:6;4:3;6:19;7:3;	71:13	54:22;55:10;56:9	50:8	move (6)
9:7;11:2,6,7,8,12,15;	lost (1)	matters (1)	misspoke (1)	18:14,24;20:9;
15:10;16:18;18:18;	66:5	22:8	67:17	22:20;25:14;53:5
22:19	lots (1)	maximum (1)	mistake (1)	moved (1)
Liebert's (1) 11:3	72:22	58:1 May (12)	60:19 MO (1)	17:25 movement (1)
likely (1)	M	11:14;18:15;20:9,	6:22	19:21
61:15	141	10;22:16;27:4;34:5;	modification (1)	moving (5)
limit (1)	mail (1)	43:4;49:24;61:21;	61:12	9:15;20:18,20;
57:24	11:24	63:14;68:5	modify (1)	24:9;53:8
limited (6)	mailed (2)	maybe (4)	65:1	much (6)

Case No. 12-12020-mg				February 11, 2015
24 5 21 15 52 22	. 1 1.40	14 14	1 (4)	22 15 22 20 10 6
24:5;31:15;52:20;	nonjudicial (1)	obtained (1)	orders (1)	22:15;23:20;48:6,
58:4,11;74:3	35:2	13:18	73:18	10;51:23
must (5)	nonmilitary (1)	obviously (3)	ordinarily (2)	paragraph (3)
29:19;38:13;52:6,	66:3	21:19;39:21;63:4	40:4;54:18	30:4;36:14;65:22
12;71:7	nor (1)	occasions (1)	originally (2)	paragraphs (2)
mutual (1)	14:11	19:4	24:12,21	30:19:37:17
24:15	North (1)	occur (1)	others' (1)	part (11)
24.13				
N.T.	6:12	69:3	29:21	11:5;24:16;27:18;
\mathbf{N}	Northern (1)	occurred (2)	otherwise (1)	28:24;35:23;37:12;
	51:16	12:5;72:2	12:23	39:17;49:7;50:2;
naked (8)	NORTON (7)	o'clock (2)	ought (1)	66:7;71:4
35:20;36:11;37:9;	7:2,8;9:13,13,13;	56:6,8	22:17	parties (4)
38:9;39:25;48:17;	13:17;14:20	offers (1)	out (15)	13:1;14:14;24:16;
50:13;67:8	notarized (1)	15:12	14:16;17:23;	63:25
name (7)	62:24	office (6)	21:22,22;22:16;	parties' (1)
9:5;10:13,24;	notary (2)	15:1,14;54:19,21;	25:13;31:4;34:13;	14:17
49:14;53:16,18;64:6	62:22,23	69:21;71:11	39:12;47:18;51:4;	Party (12)
names (1)	note (5)	Officer (2)	52:15,21;63:25;64:6	4:5;9:14,15;18:10;
63:25	17:23;57:9;69:16;	7:20;26:15	outlined (1)	20:20;29:2;31:7;
nature (2)	70:16,18	omission (1)	21:16	32:5;34:3;54:14;
27:21;34:23	notes (4)	49:17	outstanding (1)	61:5,23
ND (1)	66:5,6;72:19;	omissions (1)	11:14	party's (1)
33:7	73:10	30:6	over (3)	20:18
necessarily (2)	notice (22)	omni (1)	49:19;68:6,7	passed (1)
	12:3;14:15;15:4;	73:25		10:21
23:25;36:23			owes (1)	
necessary (4)	16:9,19;17:22;27:6;	Omnibus (10)	13:25	past (1)
64:25;65:2,6,23	28:23;30:8;31:2;	3:2,4,9,15;24:11;	owing (2)	56:18
need (5)	32:5;39:4,15;40:18;	26:3;53:10;55:20;	26:12;59:1	patient (1)
43:9,9;58:6,9;63:8	46:8;47:7,9;49:4;	58:16,17	own (4)	56:2
needless (2)	54:4,17;56:12;73:24	once (1)	46:25;47:19;	Pause (4)
21:24;61:9	notices (2)	52:9	61:21;62:18	8:12;46:14;56:4;
negligence (9)	28:2;31:21	One (21)	owner (1)	60:24
29:12,17,19;33:4,	number (9)	2:17;8:22,23;	65:3	payable (1)
9,18,19;37:14;44:16	8:3,19;50:4;59:7,	10:15;13:6;21:3;	03.3	64:24
		23:6,9;24:13,17;	P	
negligent (5)	8,18;63:17,19;66:19		I	payment (1)
12:23;30:6;37:4;	numbers (1)	28:14;43:15,17;		11:11
48:2;51:6	59:6	46:11;53:11,21;	PA (1)	payments (1)
neither (1)	numeral (1)	55:25;66:17;67:16;	62:24	11:21
14:10	24:10	73:5,15	Pablo (1)	PC (1)
nevertheless (1)	numerous (1)	only (7)	60:16	7:11
22:12	19:4	19:9;24:13;27:8;	Pack (1)	Pennsylvania (6)
New (11)	NY (4)	48:18;54:2;55:18;	23:10	14:10,24;15:11;
2:18,18;4:23;6:5;	4:23;6:5;7:6,14	72:7	page (9)	16:14,19;22:11
7:6;14:16;34:11;	1.23,0.3,7.0,11	operations@escribersnet (1)	24:10;36:8;38:17;	per (1)
	0	4:25		62:24
40:25;52:15;54:19;	U		53:9;58:15;64:13;	
61:13	1. (14)	OPERATOR (1)	66:20;69:4;70:12	percent (1)
Next (10)	objected (1)	25:7	nogog (/I)	44:24
40 40 45 50 40 5	10 17		pages (4)	D (2)
13:19;17:20;18:5,	12:15	opportunity (10)	29:23;57:23;58:2,	Perez (2)
14;19:2;23:23;30:4;	Objection (44)	opportunity (10) 19:13;22:1;24:16,	29:23;57:23;58:2, 3	33:6;51:15
		opportunity (10)	29:23;57:23;58:2,	
14;19:2;23:23;30:4;	Objection (44)	opportunity (10) 19:13;22:1;24:16,	29:23;57:23;58:2, 3	33:6;51:15
14;19:2;23:23;30:4; 53:6;55:19,22	Objection (44) 3:3,4,9,15;12:16; 13:3;24:12,19,21,22,	opportunity (10) 19:13;22:1;24:16, 24;39:22;42:3;	29:23;57:23;58:2, 3 paid (4)	33:6;51:15 performance (1) 28:3
14;19:2;23:23;30:4; 53:6;55:19,22 Nikki (1) 59:10	Objection (44) 3:3,4,9,15;12:16; 13:3;24:12,19,21,22, 25;25:24,24;26:4,13,	opportunity (10) 19:13;22:1;24:16, 24;39:22;42:3; 61:16;62:16;69:22; 71:12	29:23;57:23;58:2, 3 paid (4) 11:15,23;13:23; 14:3	33:6;51:15 performance (1)
14;19:2;23:23;30:4; 53:6;55:19,22 Nikki (1) 59:10 nineteen (1)	Objection (44) 3:3,4,9,15;12:16; 13:3;24:12,19,21,22, 25;25:24,24;26:4,13, 16,19;40:13,14;	opportunity (10) 19:13;22:1;24:16, 24;39:22;42:3; 61:16;62:16;69:22; 71:12 opposed (2)	29:23;57:23;58:2, 3 paid (4) 11:15,23;13:23; 14:3 Panaszewicz (13)	33:6;51:15 performance (1) 28:3 performing (1) 27:18
14;19:2;23:23;30:4; 53:6;55:19,22 Nikki (1) 59:10 nineteen (1) 58:18	Objection (44) 3:3,4,9,15;12:16; 13:3;24:12,19,21,22, 25;25:24,24;26:4,13, 16,19;40:13,14; 41:20;42:1,1,5,16;	opportunity (10) 19:13;22:1;24:16, 24;39:22;42:3; 61:16;62:16;69:22; 71:12 opposed (2) 24:18;44:5	29:23;57:23;58:2, 3 paid (4) 11:15,23;13:23; 14:3 Panaszewicz (13) 3:12;7:12;10:14;	33:6;51:15 performance (1) 28:3 performing (1) 27:18 perhaps (4)
14;19:2;23:23;30:4; 53:6;55:19,22 Nikki (1) 59:10 nineteen (1) 58:18 NOLAN (15)	Objection (44) 3:3,4,9,15;12:16; 13:3;24:12,19,21,22, 25;25:24,24;26:4,13, 16,19;40:13,14; 41:20;42:1,1,5,16; 44:10;48:19;52:15,	opportunity (10) 19:13;22:1;24:16, 24;39:22;42:3; 61:16;62:16;69:22; 71:12 opposed (2) 24:18;44:5 opposition (3)	29:23;57:23;58:2, 3 paid (4) 11:15,23;13:23; 14:3 Panaszewicz (13) 3:12;7:12;10:14; 53:12,15,17;54:1;	33:6;51:15 performance (1) 28:3 performing (1) 27:18 perhaps (4) 44:15;45:10;
14;19:2;23:23;30:4; 53:6;55:19,22 Nikki (1) 59:10 nineteen (1) 58:18 NOLAN (15) 9:20,25,25;20:24,	Objection (44) 3:3,4,9,15;12:16; 13:3;24:12,19,21,22, 25;25:24,24;26:4,13, 16,19;40:13,14; 41:20;42:1,1,5,16; 44:10;48:19;52:15, 19,25;53:10;55:3,11,	opportunity (10) 19:13;22:1;24:16, 24;39:22;42:3; 61:16;62:16;69:22; 71:12 opposed (2) 24:18;44:5 opposition (3) 56:7;57:25;62:5	29:23;57:23;58:2, 3 paid (4) 11:15,23;13:23; 14:3 Panaszewicz (13) 3:12;7:12;10:14; 53:12,15,17;54:1; 55:8;56:17;57:7,14;	33:6;51:15 performance (1) 28:3 performing (1) 27:18 perhaps (4) 44:15;45:10; 47:17;69:24
14;19:2;23:23;30:4; 53:6;55:19,22 Nikki (1) 59:10 nineteen (1) 58:18 NOLAN (15) 9:20,25,25;20:24, 24;21:2,7,9;23:5,5,	Objection (44) 3:3,4,9,15;12:16; 13:3;24:12,19,21,22, 25;25:24,24;26:4,13, 16,19;40:13,14; 41:20;42:1,1,5,16; 44:10;48:19;52:15, 19,25;53:10;55:3,11, 17;56:7;58:17,18;	opportunity (10) 19:13;22:1;24:16, 24;39:22;42:3; 61:16;62:16;69:22; 71:12 opposed (2) 24:18;44:5 opposition (3) 56:7;57:25;62:5 order (18)	29:23;57:23;58:2, 3 paid (4) 11:15,23;13:23; 14:3 Panaszewicz (13) 3:12;7:12;10:14; 53:12,15,17;54:1; 55:8;56:17;57:7,14; 58:12;73:25	33:6;51:15 performance (1) 28:3 performing (1) 27:18 perhaps (4) 44:15;45:10; 47:17;69:24 period (1)
14;19:2;23:23;30:4; 53:6;55:19,22 Nikki (1) 59:10 nineteen (1) 58:18 NOLAN (15) 9:20,25,25;20:24, 24;21:2,7,9;23:5,5, 11,13,16,24;24:4	Objection (44) 3:3,4,9,15;12:16; 13:3;24:12,19,21,22, 25;25:24,24;26:4,13, 16,19;40:13,14; 41:20;42:1,1,5,16; 44:10;48:19;52:15, 19,25;53:10;55:3,11, 17;56:7;58:17,18; 59:2,4,18,19,25;	opportunity (10) 19:13;22:1;24:16, 24;39:22;42:3; 61:16;62:16;69:22; 71:12 opposed (2) 24:18;44:5 opposition (3) 56:7;57:25;62:5 order (18) 19:18;22:22;	29:23;57:23;58:2, 3 paid (4) 11:15,23;13:23; 14:3 Panaszewicz (13) 3:12;7:12;10:14; 53:12,15,17;54:1; 55:8;56:17;57:7,14; 58:12;73:25 Panaszewicz's (3)	33:6;51:15 performance (1) 28:3 performing (1) 27:18 perhaps (4) 44:15;45:10; 47:17;69:24 period (1) 71:9
14;19:2;23:23;30:4; 53:6;55:19,22 Nikki (1) 59:10 nineteen (1) 58:18 NOLAN (15) 9:20,25,25;20:24, 24;21:2,7,9;23:5,5, 11,13,16,24;24:4 nondebtor (4)	Objection (44) 3:3,4,9,15;12:16; 13:3;24:12,19,21,22, 25;25:24,24;26:4,13, 16,19;40:13,14; 41:20;42:1,1,5,16; 44:10;48:19;52:15, 19,25;53:10;55:3,11, 17;56:7;58:17,18; 59:2,4,18,19,25; 62:4;69:4;72:24	opportunity (10) 19:13;22:1;24:16, 24;39:22;42:3; 61:16;62:16;69:22; 71:12 opposed (2) 24:18;44:5 opposition (3) 56:7;57:25;62:5 order (18) 19:18;22:22; 30:23;39:14;49:23,	29:23;57:23;58:2, 3 paid (4) 11:15,23;13:23; 14:3 Panaszewicz (13) 3:12;7:12;10:14; 53:12,15,17;54:1; 55:8;56:17;57:7,14; 58:12;73:25 Panaszewicz's (3) 54:5,24;55:3	33:6;51:15 performance (1) 28:3 performing (1) 27:18 perhaps (4) 44:15;45:10; 47:17;69:24 period (1) 71:9 permissible (1)
14;19:2;23:23;30:4; 53:6;55:19,22 Nikki (1) 59:10 nineteen (1) 58:18 NOLAN (15) 9:20,25,25;20:24, 24;21:2,7,9;23:5,5, 11,13,16,24;24:4	Objection (44) 3:3,4,9,15;12:16; 13:3;24:12,19,21,22, 25;25:24,24;26:4,13, 16,19;40:13,14; 41:20;42:1,1,5,16; 44:10;48:19;52:15, 19,25;53:10;55:3,11, 17;56:7;58:17,18; 59:2,4,18,19,25;	opportunity (10) 19:13;22:1;24:16, 24;39:22;42:3; 61:16;62:16;69:22; 71:12 opposed (2) 24:18;44:5 opposition (3) 56:7;57:25;62:5 order (18) 19:18;22:22;	29:23;57:23;58:2, 3 paid (4) 11:15,23;13:23; 14:3 Panaszewicz (13) 3:12;7:12;10:14; 53:12,15,17;54:1; 55:8;56:17;57:7,14; 58:12;73:25 Panaszewicz's (3)	33:6;51:15 performance (1) 28:3 performing (1) 27:18 perhaps (4) 44:15;45:10; 47:17;69:24 period (1) 71:9 permissible (1) 17:6
14;19:2;23:23;30:4; 53:6;55:19,22 Nikki (1) 59:10 nineteen (1) 58:18 NOLAN (15) 9:20,25,25;20:24, 24;21:2,7,9;23:5,5, 11,13,16,24;24:4 nondebtor (4)	Objection (44) 3:3,4,9,15;12:16; 13:3;24:12,19,21,22, 25;25:24,24;26:4,13, 16,19;40:13,14; 41:20;42:1,1,5,16; 44:10;48:19;52:15, 19,25;53:10;55:3,11, 17;56:7;58:17,18; 59:2,4,18,19,25; 62:4;69:4;72:24	opportunity (10) 19:13;22:1;24:16, 24;39:22;42:3; 61:16;62:16;69:22; 71:12 opposed (2) 24:18;44:5 opposition (3) 56:7;57:25;62:5 order (18) 19:18;22:22; 30:23;39:14;49:23,	29:23;57:23;58:2, 3 paid (4) 11:15,23;13:23; 14:3 Panaszewicz (13) 3:12;7:12;10:14; 53:12,15,17;54:1; 55:8;56:17;57:7,14; 58:12;73:25 Panaszewicz's (3) 54:5,24;55:3	33:6;51:15 performance (1) 28:3 performing (1) 27:18 perhaps (4) 44:15;45:10; 47:17;69:24 period (1) 71:9 permissible (1) 17:6
14;19:2;23:23;30:4; 53:6;55:19,22 Nikki (1) 59:10 nineteen (1) 58:18 NOLAN (15) 9:20,25,25;20:24, 24;21:2,7,9;23:5,5, 11,13,16,24;24:4 nondebtor (4) 13:7;19:14;20:11, 13	Objection (44) 3:3,4,9,15;12:16; 13:3;24:12,19,21,22, 25;25:24,24;26:4,13, 16,19;40:13,14; 41:20;42:1,1,5,16; 44:10;48:19;52:15, 19,25;53:10;55:3,11, 17;56:7;58:17,18; 59:2,4,18,19,25; 62:4;69:4;72:24 objections (2) 13:4;52:1	opportunity (10) 19:13;22:1;24:16, 24;39:22;42:3; 61:16;62:16;69:22; 71:12 opposed (2) 24:18;44:5 opposition (3) 56:7;57:25;62:5 order (18) 19:18;22:22; 30:23;39:14;49:23, 25;51:25;52:4,24; 56:12;60:6;61:21,	29:23;57:23;58:2, 3 paid (4) 11:15,23;13:23; 14:3 Panaszewicz (13) 3:12;7:12;10:14; 53:12,15,17;54:1; 55:8;56:17;57:7,14; 58:12;73:25 Panaszewicz's (3) 54:5,24;55:3 paper (2) 23:19;61:4	33:6;51:15 performance (1) 28:3 performing (1) 27:18 perhaps (4) 44:15;45:10; 47:17;69:24 period (1) 71:9 permissible (1)
14;19:2;23:23;30:4; 53:6;55:19,22 Nikki (1) 59:10 nineteen (1) 58:18 NOLAN (15) 9:20,25,25;20:24, 24;21:2,7,9;23:5,5, 11,13,16,24;24:4 nondebtor (4) 13:7;19:14;20:11, 13 nonfrivolous (1)	Objection (44) 3:3,4,9,15;12:16; 13:3;24:12,19,21,22, 25;25:24,24;26:4,13, 16,19;40:13,14; 41:20;42:1,1,5,16; 44:10;48:19;52:15, 19,25;53:10;55:3,11, 17;56:7;58:17,18; 59:2,4,18,19,25; 62:4;69:4;72:24 objections (2) 13:4;52:1 obligation (3)	opportunity (10) 19:13;22:1;24:16, 24;39:22;42:3; 61:16;62:16;69:22; 71:12 opposed (2) 24:18;44:5 opposition (3) 56:7;57:25;62:5 order (18) 19:18;22:22; 30:23;39:14;49:23, 25;51:25;52:4,24; 56:12;60:6;61:21, 25;62:14,24;73:3,13,	29:23;57:23;58:2, 3 paid (4) 11:15,23;13:23; 14:3 Panaszewicz (13) 3:12;7:12;10:14; 53:12,15,17;54:1; 55:8;56:17;57:7,14; 58:12;73:25 Panaszewicz's (3) 54:5,24;55:3 paper (2) 23:19;61:4 papers (8)	33:6;51:15 performance (1) 28:3 performing (1) 27:18 perhaps (4) 44:15;45:10; 47:17;69:24 period (1) 71:9 permissible (1) 17:6 permission (1) 22:1
14;19:2;23:23;30:4; 53:6;55:19,22 Nikki (1) 59:10 nineteen (1) 58:18 NOLAN (15) 9:20,25,25;20:24, 24;21:2,7,9;23:5,5, 11,13,16,24;24:4 nondebtor (4) 13:7;19:14;20:11, 13	Objection (44) 3:3,4,9,15;12:16; 13:3;24:12,19,21,22, 25;25:24,24;26:4,13, 16,19;40:13,14; 41:20;42:1,1,5,16; 44:10;48:19;52:15, 19,25;53:10;55:3,11, 17;56:7;58:17,18; 59:2,4,18,19,25; 62:4;69:4;72:24 objections (2) 13:4;52:1	opportunity (10) 19:13;22:1;24:16, 24;39:22;42:3; 61:16;62:16;69:22; 71:12 opposed (2) 24:18;44:5 opposition (3) 56:7;57:25;62:5 order (18) 19:18;22:22; 30:23;39:14;49:23, 25;51:25;52:4,24; 56:12;60:6;61:21,	29:23;57:23;58:2, 3 paid (4) 11:15,23;13:23; 14:3 Panaszewicz (13) 3:12;7:12;10:14; 53:12,15,17;54:1; 55:8;56:17;57:7,14; 58:12;73:25 Panaszewicz's (3) 54:5,24;55:3 paper (2) 23:19;61:4	33:6;51:15 performance (1) 28:3 performing (1) 27:18 perhaps (4) 44:15;45:10; 47:17;69:24 period (1) 71:9 permissible (1) 17:6 permission (1)

Case No. 12-12020-mg		T	T	February 11, 2015
33:8;54:19	47:19;67:22;68:20	19:11;23:16;	30:9;49:22;51:14;	Queens (1)
permits (1)	pointed (2)	31:20;60:16;62:9	56:23;63:6;67:4	54:22
62:17	31:4;37:17	principal (4)	property (3)	quick (1)
permitted (1)	points (3)	13:4;14:11;15:13;	27:7;65:6,24	21:14
54:2	21:14;26:25;57:22	17:2	protect (1)	quitclaim (1)
person (1)	portion (1)	Prior (2)	65:3	66:4
58:6	62:17	35:1,1	protects (2)	quite (1)
person's (2)	posed (1)	PRIORE (3)	33:25;34:1	55:4
61:5;64:6	33:2	7:24;59:20,21	prove (4)	quote (2)
pertains (1)	posited (1)	privilege (6)	26:6;39:16;42:6;	27:23;29:24
24:14	56:16	28:10;29:15,15;	43:14	quoted (1)
petition (1)	position (8)	33:25;34:1;38:18	proven (1)	71:10
61:3	17:15;20:3,4,5;	privileged (1)	44:20	Th.
ph (3)	28:10;43:6;50:22;	28:4	provide (1)	R
8:20;12:19;14:15	69:11	Pro (4)	11:8	
phone (8)	possibility (1) 41:14	7:23;9:16;57:14; 67:18	provided (5) 11:12,25;13:7;	raise (4)
25:4,8,11,12; 26:17;53:13;54:18;	possible (1)	probable (1)	27:21;64:7	13:3;38:14;43:15; 62:18
59:21	40:9	29:18	provides (2)	raised (6)
phrasing (1)	post (2)	probably (2)	27:18;48:21	21:2,3;24:22;41:8;
30:12	15:1;24:2	23:22;35:17	public (1)	68:24;69:13
physical (2)	precisely (1)	Proc (1)	49:18	raises (1)
36:17,19	13:17	2:5	publication (3)	62:19
piece (1)	preference (3)	procedure (4)	28:2;38:21,24	raising (2)
72:9	11:5;14:2;22:8	13:18;14:18;46:1;	publish (1)	57:14;69:23
piecemeal (1)	preferences (1)	61:2	28:24	rather (4)
24:18	13:24	procedures (1)	published (1)	17:23;27:1;35:3;
place (8)	prejudice (10)	28:3	39:3	44:10
12:2;14:10,11;	15:17,20,23;20:18,	proceed (2)	publishing (2)	ratify (1)
15:14;17:2;46:2;	19,22;21:18,20;52:1,	51:3;55:5	28:23;39:15	66:10
66:16,18	25	proceeded (1)	pure (2)	ratifying (1)
placed (1)	prejudiced (3)	68:9	43:18;73:4	36:18
44:5	13:1;22:18,19	proceeding (10)	Purported (1)	RAY (3)
Plaintiff (8)	premise (1)	3:17;4:2;8:16,19,	3:9	6:7;9:21;21:12
2:4;10:1;13:21,23;	31:18	25;9:8;10:17;40:4;	purportedly (2)	RE (3)
36:16,21;38:22;40:8	prepared (2)	54:14;65:4	34:14;66:25	3:2,8,14
plaintiffs (1)	9:2;48:4	proceedings (1)	purporting (1)	reach (1)
9:14	preparing (1) 57:16	74:5	56:17	21:22
plaintiff's (2)	pre-petition (2)	process (4) 17:24;18:19,20;	purpose (3)	reached (1)
36:19;38:25 plan (2)	26:5;58:19	66:7	36:16;38:18;61:8 pursuant (5)	21:25 read (10)
13:8;19:5	preponderance (2)	projects (3)	11:9;14:4,5;19:16,	16:3;29:24;36:11;
plausible (6)	26:6;43:14	11:10,14;14:5	19	39:24;48:5;51:12,
37:12;52:6;69:25;	PRESENT (3)	promissory (2)	pursued (1)	13;52:8;62:17;65:11
72:2,8,12	7:19;22:1;73:8	66:5,6	66:14	readily (1)
plausibly (1)	presented (3)	promptly (2)	pursuing (2)	50:22
69:17	43:18;57:17;61:7	54:4,23	28:24;34:2	reading (1)
plead (3)	presenting (1)	prong (1)	put (20)	51:22
33:20;39:16;50:16	61:2	17:11	22:9;31:15;37:2,8;	real (1)
pleaded (1)	president (4)	proof (19)	40:17,17,18;42:8;	40:2
41:8	62:25;63:1;66:22,	11:16;30:16,22,	43:7,10,10;44:9,9;	reason (2)
pleading (7)	23	25;31:1,3;32:16,21;	45:11,23;46:2;	12:23;46:17
40:7;41:4;45:8,18;	presidents (1)	35:14;36:6;37:11;	63:16;66:24;67:3;	reasonable (5)
46:22;61:3;62:8	63:23	40:14;41:4,10;42:6;	69:5	38:23;45:24;61:6,
pleadings (3)	presumption (2)	45:22;57:8,12;69:14	puts (3)	16;71:19
26:24;51:21;62:3	15:4,4	proofs (2)	47:17;48:21;50:22	reasonably (1)
Please (2)	presumptuous (1)	26:4;58:18	putting (2)	61:18
8:2;19:2	55:2	proper (10)	57:17;62:11	reasons (5)
point (18)	pretty (1)	13:20;14:12,18;		17:1;22:23;26:19;
16:8;17:13,20,23;	39:13	16:22;17:9;18:23;	Q	53:1;55:11
18:14,17;19:2; 21:20;33:7,13;36:10,	prevails (1) 72:5	19:24;22:11,12;49:9 properly (10)	qualified (2)	rebutted (2)
22;38:20;46:7,21;	previously (5)	13:5,18;14:8;29:2;	34:1;38:18	15:5;69:15 rec (1)
<u></u>	previously (3)	13.3,10,14.0,47.4,	المحر, المحر	100 (1)

Case No. 12-12020-111g			T	February 11, 2013
14:25	26:21;59:17	32:24;33:20	22:14;60:25	40:13;50:13;
receipt (1)	relates (2)	RESCAP (23)	right (63)	51:15;70:4
15:4	3:11;63:13	2:3;3:3,8,14,17;	8:2;10:3;13:22;	San (1)
				36:4
receive (2)	release (5)	4:2;7:21,25;9:6;	17:20,25;20:23;21:9,	
15:7;16:9	13:7;19:6,14;	10:1;11:5,13;19:5;	11;22:5;23:1,3,9,12,	sanctioned (1)
received (5)	20:11,13	20:25;23:14;24:8,	24;25:17,21;27:4;	62:1
12:3;15:1;23:19;	relevant (1)	11;26:15;53:8,9;	28:13;29:7;30:14;	satisfactorily (1)
34:4;59:3	19:14	58:14,16;59:21	32:8,18,20;33:23;	33:20
recently (1)	reliable (1)	ResCap's (1)	34:9,20;35:5;36:5;	satisfied (2)
55:18	14:6	21:21	40:6,11;41:16;	44:14;46:22
reckless (21)	reliance (2)	rescind (3)	42:22;43:11,20;44:1,	satisfy (1)
29:20;30:7,10,17,	27:20;71:18	46:7;47:7;49:3	2;45:4,6,19;46:18;	17:10
17;35:19,23;36:20;	relinquish (1)	rescinded (3)	47:3,16,21;48:7,18;	saved (1)
37:12,18;38:9,24;	29:14	31:21,22;42:23	51:24;52:24;53:5,20,	28:10
39:18;40:1;41:14;	rely (2)	rescission (1)	24;54:11;55:13;	saying (2)
42:9;43:8;44:15;	48:6;71:20	31:2	56:5;58:11,12;	69:17;72:4
45:12;48:22;50:8	relying (1)	rescissions (1)	59:13;60:12;66:8;	schedule (3)
recklessly (1)	65:15	31:20	67:11;69:8;70:14,	24:23;52:16;57:20
37:25	remained (1)	Residential (1)	22;72:17	scheduled (1)
recog (1)	11:10	8:3	rights (2)	52:22
33:8	remaining (1)	resolution (10)	29:21;42:9	scheduling (1)
recognized (1)	52:16	17:24;18:19;	rights' (1)	73:25
29:19	remedial (1)	21:23;63:20;64:16,	38:25	SCHROCK (11)
Recognizing (1)	31:19	23;65:18,23;67:4;	rise (1)	6:7;9:19,21,21,24;
46:8	removed (1)	68:19	33:3	21:11,12,12;22:3,4,
record (13)	23:22	resolve (1)	risk (1)	25
22:23;36:12;46:3;	renewed (1)	59:11	47:19	scintilla (1)
49:21;52:9;53:1;	52:19	resolved (3)	robosigning (2)	45:24
54:3,6;57:18;67:22;	repeat (2)	12:8,12;39:7	62:23;63:8	scope (1)
68:13,21,22	32:25;52:9	respect (8)	role (1)	34:23
records (5)	repeated (1)	17:21;32:23;	34:16	screwed (1)
26:9,11;49:18;	67:24	60:12;61:24;62:2;	Roman (1)	42:20
58:23,25	repeatedly (1)	65:21;66:9;73:19	24:10	Se (3)
record's (1)	41:3	respectful (1)	Romina (1)	7:23;57:14;67:18
21:18	reply (11)	54:17	8:20	seated (1)
refer (2)	24:20;25:23;26:2,	respond (8)	ROSALES (1)	8:2
35:25;63:12			7:11	Second (8)
	13,16,17,20;56:8; 58:2;59:17,19	24:24;25:16;	ROSARIO (30)	
referenced (1) 68:19	report (7)	39:24;46:2;52:21; 62:15;69:19;71:7	7:11,16;10:10,13,	12:18,20,24;16:2; 37:2;52:10,10;60:23
	32:17,22;35:15;	respondents (1)	14,19,21;53:16,17,	
referred (1)		59:1		secretaries (1)
39:25 referring (4)	63:3;67:18;69:8,14		19,20,23;54:7,8,10;	63:22
	represent (4)	response (18)	55:13,15;56:2,3,5,	secretary (4)
28:9;29:15;66:19;	11:1;26:5;54:5;	12:3,16;21:3;	16,22,25;57:2,20,21;	64:6,10,14;67:5
70:4	58:19	25:25;26:10;36:1;	58:4,5,7,10	Section (9)
refinance (1)	representation (3)	42:2;45:23;46:1;	R-O-S-A-R-I-O (1)	27:17;28:1,5,5,9;
64:25	54:23;64:12;71:19	55:9,10,17;57:15;	53:19 D 1 (14)	29:15;33:20;52:5,5
regard (4)	representative (1)	63:15;66:20;70:2,	Rule (14)	sections (1)
21:17,18;39:1;	53:13	13;73:16	12:1;13:15;14:12;	27:16
40:16	represented (1)	responses (5)	19:17,17,19;41:3,3;	secured (1)
regarding (3)	60:15	58:24;59:2,3,5,24	61:1,20;62:1,7,11,17	27:22
27:21;65:5;66:5	request (6)	responsible (1)	Rules (3)	securing (2)
regards (3)	12:4,7,12;32:16;	11:10	14:17;17:6;61:1	65:7,24
31:3,23;32:13	52:15;55:16	result (2)	C	seeking (2)
registered (7)	requested (1)	24:20;43:4	S	13:1;40:21
14:11;65:1,5,7,8,	59:25	resulting (1)	1 (04)	seeks (3)
24,25	require (1)	27:20	sale (24)	18:8;26:4;58:18
Registration (1)	54:17	retained (3)	27:6;31:2,21;	seemed (2)
64:15	required (6)	54:1,16;55:18	39:16;42:24;46:8;	33:8;51:22
reiterating (1)	27:18;28:3;30:23;	returned (2)	47:8,20;49:3;65:10;	seems (4)
26:23	50:2;51:7;66:7	69:21;71:11	66:2;69:3,9,9,11,16;	45:14;47:19;
rejected (1)	requirement (1)	reversal (1)	70:1,17,18;71:3,22;	69:23,24
46:24	17:10	61:12	72:2,4,16	sees (3)
related (2)	requirements (2)	reviewed (2)	same (4)	47:9,10,10
		<u> </u>		<u> </u>

Case No. 12-12020-mg		09 01 92		February 11, 2015
sell (1)	several (1)	somewhat (3)	States (4)	substitute (13)
71:4	21:15	22:9;50:22;63:4	2:16;65:23;69:8,	26:22;30:11;32:3;
send (3)	shall (2)	soon (1)	20	34:4,17;35:10;37:13,
24:1,2;70:23	27:19;28:4	21:22	status (2)	24;39:15;43:25;
sent (4)	Shapiro (1)	sorry (11)	24:3;66:3	46:25;62:22;66:11
11:24;12:3;32:16;	4:20	8:7;10:19,21;	statute (1)	substituted (4)
47:14	Sharona (1)	15:19;25:5;32:3;	31:25	29:3;42:20;49:17;
sentence (1)	4:20	33:25;42:4;63:16;	statutes (1)	66:15
35:1	shift (5)	68:7;70:8	34:25	substitution (16)
separate (6)	42:17;43:9,11,13;	sound (1)	Statutory (1)	29:2,4;31:5,8;
9:3;37:4;39:6;	45:12	21:4	27:16	34:4;49:4,12,22;
43:1;68:24;73:13	shifted (5)	Southern (1)	staying (3)	63:14;64:3;65:9,21;
separately (1)	42:6;45:13;69:15;	54:9	21:4,6,8	66:1,10;67:5;68:14
34:11	71:14;72:8	Specialized (6)	step (1)	sued (1)
September (1)	shifts (1)	66:11,12,15,17;	42:4	34:11
12:5	44:6	67:14;68:9	Stephan (9)	suffer (3)
serious (2)	show (11)	specific (8)	62:25;63:5,5;64:1,	15:18,21;36:16
22:13;62:10	26:11;36:24;	17:23;18:19;26:7;	21;65:17;66:9,22;	sufficient (10)
serve (1)	43:16;45:11;50:2,3;	27:1;35:13;36:25;	67:4	29:13;37:9,19,23;
16:23	58:25;61:23,25;	58:20;61:22	Stephan's (3)	38:2,13;40:2,3;
served (8)	62:14;73:3	specifically (12)	63:13,17,18	48:25;51:2
13:5;14:8,15,21;	showing (3)	12:10,18;34:12,	steps (1)	sufficiently (4)
15:3,14.8,13,21,	14:21,25;38:22	22;36:1,8;44:9;	69:6	30:16;38:14;41:8;
17:11	shown (3)	61:14,18;63:19;		48:12
service (16)	25:2;65:8,25	64:12;68:19	still (1) 42:19	
14:12,18,20;15:2;	shows (1)	spell (1)	stop (2)	suggest (1) 8:15
	13:17	53:18	_ ` '	
16:16;17:3,5,8,9,15,		spoke (1)	18:22;27:23	suggested (1) 30:7
16;19:24;21:21;	sic (2)	53:21	story (1) 45:14	
22:9,10;42:21	69:1,10			Suite (3)
serviced (1) 68:5	side (1) 43:11	spoken (1) 55:8	straightforward (1)	4:22;6:21;7:13
servicer (10)			55:8 Street (4)	Sullivan (5)
	sides (1) 57:18	stage (1) 22:7	Street (4)	59:8;60:9,11;73:6, 19
30:5,11,11;42:21;			4:22;6:20;7:4,13	
43:25;46:25;47:11,	signed (8)	stand (2)	strong (1)	summon (1) 14:21
17,18;49:15	23:19,20;29:4;	20:18;21:16	22:8	
Services (7) 3:18;11:9,11,12;	62:25;63:14;64:2;	standard (9)	struggling (1) 41:17	summons (7)
	66:22;67:4	28:18;29:25;		11:24;14:9,22;
16:17;23:15;26:21	signing (1)	32:25;40:13;43:22;	subdivision (2)	15:10;16:23;18:23;
servicing (2) 67:15;68:7	61:2 simply (13)	46:22;51:13,14,15	61:22,24	19:25 Superior (1)
		standards (1) 41:4	submission (3)	36:3
set (8) 26:19;28:3;36:15;	8:15;13:22;15:5;		62:11;72:25;73:12	
	16:9,9;22:22;31:23;	standing (4)	submit (5) 22:22;56:12;60:6;	supplement (1)
43:1;51:15;55:11;	32:4;36:11;39:3;	37:8;46:15,16;		46:3
56:9;62:2	48:22;55:10;70:19	71:23	67:21;73:15	supplemental (8)
sets (2)	skimming (1)	standpoint (2)	submits (1)	14:25;24:21,25;
51:14;69:18	72:19 slower (1)	44:8,11 standstill (1)	15:6 submitted (8)	25:24;26:14,16;
setting (1)	65:12		15:7;26:14;32:22;	42:1;59:20
62:14		12:9		supplied (1)
settled (5)	so-called (1)	start (1)	48:5;59:19;62:5;	14:24
34:12,12;39:9;	32:17	31:14	67:18,18	support (16)
49:24;50:17	solely (2)	starting (1)	submitting (1)	25:24;26:13;
settlement (3)	3:5,11	31:18	61:3	37:11;45:11,24;
21:25;23:17,18	somebody (4)	state (12)	subsequent (1)	48:21;50:6,9,20;
seven (2)	10:11;18:8,22;	30:10;37:3;38:3;	19:21	59:18,18;61:14,15;
64:23;71:7	54:13	40:8;41:11;48:25;	substantial (4)	67:9,25;68:14
Seventh (1)	somehow (1)	51:2;52:4,6;54:3;	21:19;22:12;	supporting (1)
14:16	33:3	57:8;69:5	51:21;62:12	63:7
Seventy- (1)	someone (1)	stated (10)	substantially (1)	supports (1)
3:3	53:14	12:2;14:23;17:15;	22:18	17:14
Seventy-fifth (2)	someplace (1)	22:23;35:10;37:10,	substantiate (2)	supposed (1)
24:11;26:3	17:5	13;53:1;69:25;72:4	39:2;46:3	71:21
Seventy-Ninth (3)	sometimes (2)	statement (2)	substantiated (1)	Sure (18)
3:9;53:10;73:25	40:21;54:20	29:14;30:13	63:18	8:18;19:1;21:18;

Case No. 12-12020-mg	. 9			February 11, 201
30:25;35:21;37:6;	11:2,4,20,25;	25:23;26:1,4,8,14,	42:18;43:23;45:17;	60:2
38:11,11;41:22;	12:25,25;13:19,20,	16;27:5,23;30:24;	67:23;71:8;72:6	validate (2)
42:12,14;45:1;	20;14:22;19:6,14;	31:25;32:16;34:24;	uncontested (3)	26:9;58:23
46:20;55:4;65:22;			55:10;59:25;60:1	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
	20:11,13	40:18,18;43:7;		vice (6)
68:4;73:8,11	thirty (21)	45:10;46:1,7;49:25;	under (29)	9:17;62:25;63:1,
surrounding (1)	52:2,12,13,18,19;	50:1;52:13,19;53:8;	11:11,15,21;	22;66:22,23
49:8	53:1;69:2,6,8,10,16,	56:8,16;58:14,18,22;	12:18;13:23,25;	view (2)
survive (1)	18;70:2,16,18;71:3,	59:3,4,9,17,19,21;	14:12;17:6,22,24;	32:10;44:6
51:3	5,15,21;72:4,15	62:15,16;63:16;	24:10;27:4,7,22;	violate (1)
Susan (1)	thoroughly (2)	65:9;66:2;72:14	30:24;32:2,3;38:15;	61:22
62:23	26:8;58:22	trustee (36)	48:25;50:1;51:2,4;	violated (6)
sustain (2)	thought (5)	26:21,22;27:5,19;	54:21;57:1;61:1,7;	33:3;34:14;61:24;
40:14;48:19	21:24;33:5;35:22;	29:2,3;30:24;31:5,8;	72:25;73:9,12	62:7,11;67:1
Sustained (1)	51:20;60:19	32:3;33:9,16;34:4,	understands (1)	violating (1)
60:4	three (4)	17;35:1,2,10;37:13,	45:5	62:1
sustaining (2)	12:21;13:4;49:19;	13,24;39:15;44:12;	undertake (1)	Virginia (3)
51:25;52:25	59:3	49:12,22;51:7,8,10,	63:23	66:12,16;67:14
system (4)	three-and-a-half (2)	11;62:22;63:14;	Underwriters (1)	void (1)
65:1,5,7,25	49:10,13	65:9,21;66:2,11,11;	8:21	19:18
				19.10
Systems (1)	throughout (3)	68:15	United (1)	XX 7
64:15	11:12;49:13,15	trustee's (7)	2:16	W
TD.	Thursday (1)	31:2,21;34:1,24;	universally (1)	T (4)
T	56:9	38:14;65:9;66:2	15:3	walk (1)
	timeliness (1)	trustor (2)	unless (3)	63:8
talking (1)	56:21	35:3,6	18:8;40:7;58:2	wanton (8)
38:18	timely (2)	Trusts (3)	unnecessary (1)	29:20;30:17;
tasks (1)	18:11;62:9	3:3,9,14	61:8	36:20;37:18,25;
64:23	title (2)	Trust's (7)	unrepresented (1)	38:9;39:25;50:7
telephone (4)	32:1,2	24:11;51:25;	61:4	warranted (2)
25:2;53:15;54:20;	titled (1)	53:10;57:5;58:2,16;	untimely (2)	61:11,17
58:8	36:9	62:12	57:1,3	Washington (6)
TELEPHONICALLY (3)	today (16)	truth (6)	unusual (1)	14:10,23;15:11,
7:19;10:1,14	11:3;15:6;19:10,	30:8,10,17;38:23;	62:5	13;16:13,19
ten (1)	15;20:12;26:17;	39:18;48:23	up (11)	way (2)
			10:9;18:11;35:17;	22:9;54:2
58:3	46:6,8;49:21;53:21;	try (3)		*
ten-day (1)	54:3;57:19;58:8,12;	54:16;59:10;70:20	36:10,23;37:23;	Wednesday (1)
23:21	59:5,21	trying (2)	40:20;42:20;48:18;	56:6
term (2)	today's (6)	18:17;21:23	54:22;55:17	week (1)
52:7;72:15	45:7;47:2;53:2,9;	turn (1)	updated (1)	55:16
terms (7)	57:16;58:15	22:16	64:1	weeks (2)
23:21;36:23,23;	told (2)	Turner (1)	upon (9)	55:21,22
39:11;63:2;66:23;	15:13;18:13	62:23	31:2,21,25;52:8;	Weil (2)
68:25	took (2)	turning (1)	65:6,10,24;66:2;	9:21;21:13
testimony (1)	68:6,7	38:16	71:20	Wells (2)
15:5	towards (1)	twenty-five (1)	use (1)	33:6;51:16
theory (3)	38:22	58:1	44:14	West (2)
40:25;41:2,8	track (1)	twenty-five-page (1)	used (1)	4:22;7:4
thereby (2)	68:1	57:24	9:23	What's (12)
33:3;36:20	tracking (1)	twice (1)	using (1)	9:4;15:17;28:18;
,	30:18	41:21	32:24	9:4;15:17;28:18; 31:3;33:1,13;39:11.
therefore (5)				
14:12;17:3;18:21;	Transcribed (1)	two (9)	utilizing (1)	21;51:24;55:22;
19:19;38:24	4:20	13:6;17:1;21:14;	44:10	69:11;70:2
therein (1)	trigger (1)	27:16;28:13;30:18;	utter (1)	whatsoever (2)
61:10	18:9	55:21,22;59:4	42:11	48:18;67:25
thereto (1)	triggered (3)		utters (1)	whenever (2)
61:24	41:4;46:7;47:7	U	37:17	52:14;54:16
third (1)	true (2)			when's (1)
9:14	35:2;64:16	ultimately (3)	V	55:19
Third- (1)	TRUST (57)	34:10;44:20;45:21		Whereupon (1)
4:4	2:3;3:17;4:2;7:21,	Um-hum (17)	VA (1)	74:5
thirdly (1)	25;9:7;10:2;11:5;	28:7,15;29:11;	66:6	whole (1)
	~~,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	20.1,13,27.11,		
•	20.25.21.10.23.6.14	30.20.33.22.35.8	valid (4)	33.13
13:1 third-party (14)	20:25;21:10;23:6,14, 19;24:8,16,20,22;	30:20;33:22;35:8, 18;40:19;41:1,6,12;	valid (4) 17:16;26:5;58:19;	33:13 wholeheartedly (1)

	//			
47:1	WL (1)	7:14	4:4	
Who's (1)	33:6	11th (1)	25th (2)	5
8:4	word (1)	55:24	55:21;56:6	_
whose (1)	8:7	12 (1)	27 (1)	5 (3)
54:19	words (3)	7:5	4:4	12:14;56:6,8
villful (6)	37:17;42:11,13	12-12020 (1)	29 (1)	56 (1)
12:22;37:18;38:9;	work (3)	8:3	69:1	36:14
40:1;41:15;50:7	11:15;52:15,21	12th (3)	2924 (5)	5th (1)
villfully (1)	working (1)	55:24;56:1,10	27:18,24;33:20;	26:2
37:25	59:10	14-01965 (1)	38:15;52:5	20.2
villing (1)	worst (1)	23:13	29th (4)	6
17:12	30:6	14-01965-mg (1)	64:2;69:10;70:6,7	U
vinds (1)	written (2)	3:17	0112,00110,7010,7	(0)
18:11	61:4;62:14	14-01969 (2)	3	6 (2)
vish (1)	wrong (5)	8:25;9:8	3	64:14;70:12
23:2	15:11;17:11;	14-01969-mg (2)	3 (4)	601 (1)
Vishnew (194)	33:23;47:14;49:5	2:5;4:2		6:4
		15-01025 (1)	58:15;61:13;	605 (1)
8:5,9,13,14,15,23;	wrongdoing (2)		65:22;69:4	7:13
9:1,2;23:3,4;24:6,7,	26:7;58:21	8:20	30 (4)	60654 (1)
7;25:15,21,22;27:3,	wrongful (1)	1533 (1)	66:20;69:7;70:4,	6:13
8,12,13,25;28:7,12,	62:21	59:7	12	64112 (1)
15,17,20;29:5,9,11;	wrongfully (1)	168 (3)	300 (1)	6:22
30:1,3,12,20,25;	49:17	29:22;34:23;52:9	6:12	6th (1)
31:9,11,13,15,18;	wrote (1)	17th (1)	30th (5)	56:8
32:8,13,18,20;33:1,	57:21	64:18	12:1;70:8,10;71:1;	2010
12,15,17,22,24;34:6,		192nd (1)	72:3	7
10,18,21;35:8,11,18,	${f Y}$	4:22	316 (2)	,
21,25;36:7,14;37:6,		19th (5)	29:22;52:10	7 (1)
15,21;38:1,5,7,11,	year (1)	25:23;68:8;69:11;	335 (1)	
16;39:6,9,11,20,23;	12:14	71:16;72:3	34:23	66:20
40:6,11,16,19,22,24;	years (4)	1st (2)	336 (1)	700 (1)
41:1,6,12,16,18,19,	49:10,13,19;50:5	68:6,8	38:17	4:22
25;42:10,12,14,18,	yesterday (2)	08.0,6	341 (1)	7004 (2)
		2		12:1;14:12
22,25;43:3,6,12,20,	12:16;14:24	4	29:23	7041 (1)
23;44:1,3,8,17,19,	York (8)	2 (2)	345 (1)	19:17
22;45:1,4,6,9,17,19,	2:18,18;4:23;6:5;	2 (3)	59:6	7552 (2)
21;46:11,15,20;47:1,	7:6;14:16;34:11;	53:9;61:9;64:13	3734 (1)	3:2;24:12
3,5,12,24;48:1,4;	54:19	2003 (1)	59:6	7667 (1)
52:13,20,23;53:5,7,		64:18	3809808 (1)	36:1
7;54:25;55:1,7,19,	1	2006 (1)	33:6	7841 (1)
21,24;56:7,11,14;		68:6	3901 (1)	3:8
58:13,13;59:15,17;	1 (6)	2008 (1)	7:13	7904 (2)
60:5,7,13;63:10,12;	12:10;26:16,17;	52:11		3:2;25:25
64:5,11,22;65:13,16,	36:2;61:7;69:4	2009 (15)	4	7922 (1)
19,22;66:10,13,17;	10 (3)	63:14;64:2;68:6,8,		3:14
67:2,7,10,13,16,20,	36:9;56:10;58:16	8;69:1,7,10,11;70:4,	4 (1)	
23;68:2,4,11,16,18,	10:10 (1)	6,7;71:1;72:3,3	61:17	7938 (1)
22;70:3,7,9,11,15,18,	2:21	2011 (5)	4/29 (1)	59:7
22,25;71:2,8,17,23;	1000 (1)	11:8,12;33:6,7;	64:1	7955 (1)
72:6,11,14,21;73:1,				59:8
	6:21	51:17	40th (1)	
5,8,11,14,17,20,22,	10018 (1)	2012 (2)	7:4	8
24;74:2,4	7:6	11:13,14	41 (1)	
Wishnew's (1)	10022 (1)	2013 (1)	19:17	8 (3)
49:20	6:5	12:20	44 (1)	7:4;24:11;41:3
vithdraw (1)	10040 (1)	2014 (4)	29:23	80 (1)
12:7	4:23	12:1,5,10;59:3	47 (6)	63:19
vithin (8)	10th (3)	2015 (2)	28:5,5,9;29:15;	8036 (1)
23:23;28:5;31:24;	12:13,17;68:6	2:20;26:1	33:20;52:5	59:7
52:2,12;53:1;71:5,7	11 (2)	22nd (1)	4801 (1)	
vithout (10)	2:20;11:13	59:2	6:20	8044 (1)
35:16;42:9;43:8;	11:56 (1)	23rd (1)	4th (3)	26:1
	***** (*)	(±)		8068 (1)
	74.5	26.1	12.15.20.22.24.22	
48:23;50:24;52:1, 25;55:1;67:8;68:17	74:5 11354 (1)	26:1 24 (1)	12:15;29:22;34:23	59:18 8068-2 (3)

12-12020-mg Doc 8766-2 Filed 06/18/15 Entered 06/18/15 12:15:09 RESIDENTIAL CAPITAL, LLC, et al. Pq 92 of 92 Pg 92 of 92 February 11, 2015 Case No. 12-12020-mg 63:17;66:19;70:12 8068-9 (2) 63:19;64:14 8073 (1) 26:2 8094 (1) 24:9 9 9 (2) 41:3;53:9 9011 (3) 62:7,11,16 9011b (2) 61:1;62:1 9011c1B (1) 61:20 973406-2250 (1) 4:24 9th (1) 63:14

Exhibit 2